

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXVI.

BALTIMORE, FEBRUARY, 1911.

No. 2.

A LITURGICAL PLAY OF JOSEPH AND HIS BRETHREN.

Some years ago, as an appendix to *Ordinaires de l'Église Cathédrale de Laon*,¹ M. le Chanoine Ulysse Chevalier published two dramatic texts from MS. 263 of the Bibliothèque de Laon,—an *Ordo Prophetarum*² and an *Ordo Stelle*,³—each of which was a valuable contribution to the study of a type of play already well known.⁴ MS. 263, however, contains another dramatic text,—an *Ordo Joseph*, treating the story of Joseph and his brethren,—of a type hitherto unknown to liturgical drama.

The manuscript before us is officially described as follows :

263. In—folio sur vélin.—(Hymni et prosae).—
xiii^e siècle. Provient de Notre-Dame.⁵

The manuscript is a Troparium-Hynarium-Provarium of the cathedral church of Laon. The dramatic texts already mentioned⁶ appear in the manuscript in an unbroken series, as follows :

¹ *Ordinaires de l'Église Cathédrale de Laon* (xiii^e et xiiii^e siècles) suivis de deux Mystères liturgiques publiés d'après les manuscrits originaux par le Chanoine Ulysse Chevalier, Paris, Picard, 1897 (Bibliothèque Liturgique, Tome Sixième).

² *Id.*, pp. 385-389.

³ *Id.*, pp. 389-394.

⁴ See E. K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, Oxford, 1903, Vol. II, pp. 41-56; H. Anz, *Die lateinischen Magierspiele*, Leipzig, 1905; M. Sepet, *Les Prophètes du Christ*, Paris, 1878.

⁵ *Catalogue général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques des Départements*, t. I, Paris, 1849, p. 155.

⁶ The manuscript contains (fol. 145r) also an unimportant version of the well known *Visitatio Sepulchri*, furnished with musical notation on four red lines. This text, which follows immediately upon the Magnificat of the First Vespers of Easter, is as follows :

In aurora processio ad Sepulchrum. Duo in albis capis intrans cantantes :

Ardens est cor nostrum.

Angeli ad eos :

Quem queritis in sepulchro, o Xpisticole ?

(1) *Ordo Prophetarum*, fol. 147^r-149^r;

(2) *Ordo Stelle*, fol. 149^r-151^r;

(3) *Ordo Joseph*, fol. 151^r-153^r,

None of these texts has musical notation.

The *Ordo Prophetarum* and the *Ordo Stelle* were, no doubt, performed at Christmas and Epiphany, respectively. Although the manuscript furnishes no indication as to the liturgical associations of the *Ordo Joseph*, printed below, this play may well have been attached to the third Sunday of Lent (Dominica III in Quadragesima), for the Lessons of Matins of this day provide a substantial part of the story of Joseph.⁷ In general the play follows closely the substance of the Biblical account.

The text below is, perhaps, a grateful addition to the body of liturgical plays for two reasons : first, in that it introduces a new subject into the repertory ; and secondly, in that it is one of the very few liturgical plays that treat stories from the Old Testament.

< fol. 151^r > ORDO IOSEPH.⁸

Letetur hodie
Chorus fidelium ;
Quiescant fabule,
Crescat silentium.
Sequantur homines

Respondent :

Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Angelus :

Non est hic ; surrexit sicut predixerat ; ite, nuntiate
quia surrexit, dicentes :

Duo :

Surrexit Dominus uere, alleluia.

Cantor :

Xpistus resurgens.

The text and the page end here. The next page (fol. 145v) begins : In die sancto Pasche ad processionem.

⁷ Genesis, cap. xxxvii.

⁸ Bibliothèque de Laon, MS. 263, fol. 151^r-153^v. The heading is preceded immediately by the concluding words of the *Ordo Stelle* (fol. 149^r-151^r),—Ey dolor est ; nolo consolari, quia non sunt. See *Ordinaires*, p. 394.

Ioseph consilium ;
 Vitent mulieres
 Nature uitium.
 Iam recitabitur
 Grauis inuidia,
 Quom Ioseph pertulit
 Fratrum nequitia.
 Si fratri nocuit
 Fratrum odium,
 Fratribus profuit
 Ioseph dominium.
 Si scire placeat
 Que sint exordia,
 De Iacob Moysi
 < fol. 151^v > Narrat historia.
 Audite pariter
 Que causa fuerit,
 Cur domus Israel
 Mare transierit.

Iacob uocat Ioseph et dicit :

Ioseph, nate
 Mi dilecte,
 Scire uolo, propera
 Circa fratres
 Atque greges,
 Si sint cuncta prospera.

Ille, accepto baculo, uadit. Fratres eum
 uidentes dicunt :

Ecce uenit
 Somniator,
 Nobis datur copia.
 Occidamus,
 Videamus,
 Si quid prosint somnia.

Ruben eum uolens liberare dicit :

Non est bonum
 Ut fraternum
 Effundamus sanguinem ;
 Sed exutum
 Recondamus
 In cisternam ueterem.
 Vestem eius
 In edinum
 Polluamus sanguinem,
 Atque patri

Per ignotum
 Remittamus hominem.

Exuunt illum et ponunt in cisternam. Appar-
 ent Hismaelite, quos uidens Iudas dicit ad fratres :

Mercatores
 Hismaelis
 Veniunt de finibus.
 Venundetur
 Transmarinis
 Et ignotis partibus ;
 Vivat puer,
 Impollutis
 Et nos simus manibus.

Iudas extrahit eum de lacu, et ducens secum ad
 mercatores dicit :

State, queso.
 Vobis uendo
 Puerum egregium ;
 Vos bis denos
 Mihi nummos
 Dabit in pretium.

Unus de mercatoribus ad socios dicit :

Festinate, socii,
 Soluite marsupium.
 Donentur argentei,
 Bonum est commercium.

Iudas, acceptis argenteis, reddit et diuidit inter
 fratres. Hismaelite Ioseph splendida ueste indu-
 tum ducunt, et uenientes ante Pharaonem dicunt :

Viuat rex in eternum.

Et transeuntes < fol. 152^r > Futiphar eunucum
 dicunt :

Puerum de nobili
 Genitum prosapia,
 Quem ostendit nobilem
 Facies eximia,
 Regali seruitio
 Volumus relinquere,
 Emptum graui precio,
 Si plus uelis emere.

Phutifar, uocato consilio, intuens puerum dicit :

Ex aspectu pueri

Bonam spem concipio.
 Nostro bene poterit
 Servire palatio.
 Date quod exigitur
 Pretium pro puero.

Consiliarii surgunt, et leti de puero dicunt ad
 dominum suum :

Libenter agimus
 Tuum imperium ;
 Gratanter addimus
 Nostrum consilium.
 Videtur utilis
 Ista mercatio.
 Dimittant puerum,
 Accepto pretio.

Mercatores, parata statera, ponderant argentum,
 et inclinantes regi, in partem uadunt. Ruben
 reuersus ad puteum et non inueniens puerum dicit :

Querens non inuenio,
 Quo me uertam nescio.
 Qui pro nobis exiit,
 Per nos frater periit.

Interim peregrinus quidam iuxta fratres Ioseph
 transiens uocatur. Dant illi tunicam Ioseph et
 dicunt :

Redde patri
 Vestem nati,
 Defunctumque nuntia.
 Si tristatur,
 Illum nostra
 Leuabit presentia.

Vadit peregrinus ad Iacob, excitat illum, os-
 endit tunicam, et dicit :

Vide, uestis
 An sit ista
 Ioseph tui filii ?
 Eius quippe
 Credens esse,
 Reportare uolui.

Iacob pauefactus surgit. Tunicam agnoscens
 dicit :

Ioseph, fili,
 Cur te misit
 Paterna stultitia !

Te crudelis
 Deuorauit
 Et insana < fol. 152^v > bestia !

Quo dicto cadit pasmatum. Accedunt filii eius
 et leuantes eum dicunt :

Care pater,
 Ne te tanti
 Vis doloris superet.
 Cum profecto
 Vitam nemo
 Mortuus recuperet.

Iacob iterum clamat :

Ioseph, fili, ut supra.

Iterum filii eius consolantur eum et dicunt :

Audi, pater,
 Liberorum
 Preces et solatia.
 Certe nosti
 Quia multos
 Occidit tristitia.

Quiescit Iacob ; sedent filii eius circa eum.
 Iterum uxor Phutifar diligens Ioseph uocat eum
 secreto. Ioseph non concedit consilio, quo uolente
 discedere, illa clamidem rapit. Ioseph dimisit et
 fugit. Illa festinat ut innocenti culpam⁹ impo-
 nat. Ante dominum suum uenit, clamidem secum
 ferens ; clamorem in hec uerba facit :

Ioseph ille
 Cui tantam
 Dedisti potentiam,
 Nos offendit
 Atque summam
 Maiestatem regiam !
 Me lasciuus
 In conclau
 Voluit opprimere !

Et ostendens clamidem dicit :

Ecce clamis
 Quam amisit
 Cum uellet discedere !

Facto clamore discedit. Eunucus ad famulos :

⁹ ms., culpat.

Hic ebreus
 Quasi reus
 Seruetur in carcere ;
 Qui dilectam
 Nobis sponsam
 Voluit opprimere.

Ioseph in carcerem uadit. Rex recordatus
 pistoris et pincerne produci iubet e carcere. Pistor
 exit cum nebulis et cophino, et pincerna cum uite
 et racemis ; quibus ante regem presentatis, pin-
 cerna ait :

Ioseph nobis sapiens
 Reuelauit somnia,
 Quod haberem gratiam
 Et pistor suspendia.

Pistor ad regem :

Parce tuo < fol. 153^r > famulo,
 Rex inuicte, Pharaon !
 Si recusas parcere,
 Fiat tua iussio.

Rex ait de pistore :

Hic dampnetur,

De pincerna :

Et hic suo
 Reddatur officio.
 Sic de illis
 Curialis
 Ordinauit ratio.

Iterum rex mittit, et Ioseph de carcere educto
 et uenienti ante se dicit :

Non ignoro
 Quanta tui
 Cordis sit prudentia,
 Qui tam mire
 Visionis
 Reuelasti somnia.

Et porrigens ei sceptrum dicit :

Per te bona
 Regni nostri
 Disponantur omnia.

Ioseph, osculata dextera, et genu inclinans regi

sessum uadit. Surgunt filii Iacob, et excitantes
 patrem dicunt :

Audi, pater,
 Nos instanter
 Fames urget ualida.
 Nobis dictum
 In Egiptum
 Quod sit ingens copia.
 Vis eamus
 Vel mittamus
 Comparandi gratia ?

Iacob dans eis argentum dicit :

Hoc argento
 De frumento
 Quod est necessarium.
 Comparete
 Reportantes
 Ad uite subsidium.
 Benjamin
 Exiguum
 Habebo solatium ;
 Hic mecum remaneat,
 In uia ne pereat.

Vadunt in Egyptum, et uenientes ante Ioseph
 dicunt :

Te, ministrum tanti regis,
 Qui sub rege cuncta regis,
 Salutantes ueneramur,
 Ne superbi uideamur.

Ioseph ad fratres :

Scire uolo
 Que sit uobis
 Veniendi ratio.
 Enarrate
 Qui uos estis,
 Et que uestra natio.

Respondent fratres et adeuntes Ioseph < h >
 dicunt :

Procurator
 Et saluator
 Totius prouincie,
 Regnum regis
 Pharaonis
 Subintramus hodie,

Ut argento
Comparatis
Onerati frugibus.

<fol. 153v> Ioseph suscipit argentum, dat eis in saculis frumentum, et cum frumento reponit argentum. Et fratres discedunt securi. Et Ioseph uocat famulos et mittit post illos dicens :

Que mora iam nostros
Detinet famulos ?
Currite citius,
Soluite saculos ;
Frumentum deferunt
Atque pecuniam.
Pati non possumus
Talem iniuriam.

Famuli ad fratres :

Fultum fecistis ;
Tormenta pati meruistis.
Procuratori
Si placet, ite mori.

Reducuntur fratres ; inuenta est pecunia in saculis ; confusi uerecundia tacent. Dicit eis Ioseph :

Furti quidem conscii
Omnes estis socii.
Sed unum de fratribus
Tenebo pro omnibus.
Carcer hunc custodiat
Donec ille ueniat
Quem pater retinuit,
Qui plus ei placuit.

Unus tenetur captus ; alii discedunt inter se dicentes :

Merito grauissimam
Patimur iniuriam.
Talis retributio
Est pro fratre uendito.

Venientes ad patrem deponunt sacculos et dicunt :

Pater dilectissime,
Nobis male contigit.
Pro nobis in laqueum
Frater noster incidit.
Quolibet euadere
Pretio non poterit,

Nisi prius Benjamin
Princeps ille uiderit.

Iacob amplexatus Benjamin exclamat :

Eya, fili Benjamin,
Fili mi, quid faciam ?
Quo te fratres distrahunt
Ad innotam patriam.
Deus te reliquerat
Pro Ioseph solatium ;
Quod te perdam, fili mi,
Mortis est inditium.

Iudas ad patrem :

Esto, queso, patiens,
Sicut pater sapiens.
Me seruum pro puero.¹⁰

KARL YOUNG.

University of Wisconsin.

TWO OLD FRENCH LYRICS HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED.

In a recent book on the musical notation of the lyrics¹ of mediæval France, Dr. Jean B. Beck divides the types of music into three classes or modi. The first modus is arranged for a verse of seven syllables. It consists of a musical scheme, which comprises a regular alternation of long and short notes, the first note and the last being long. An example of such a verse is the song '*En mai quant la matinée.*' A variation of this modus is arranged for eight syllables instead of seven. In this case the line begins with a short note, but in other respects it is wholly like the form for a verse of seven syllables. A poem of this second type is the second one published in the present article, '*En la douce saison d'estey.*' The second modus is arranged for a seven syllable verse, but differs

¹⁰ Here ends the page and the fragment. Two folios have been torn out at this point. On folio 154^r begins, in a later hand (saec. xiv in.), a series of hymns of the Canonical Office.

¹ J. B. Beck ; *Die Melodien der Troubadours*. Strassburg, 1908.

from the first modus, in that the accented syllable comes on a short note. Both of these modi count two syllables to a measure. The third modus is for the decasyllabic verse and has three syllables to the measure instead of two. It is the second modus which Beck considers the genuine French rhythm, because it represents equality in the value of the principal and minor word accents, since the stronger beats fall on the short notes, while the weakness of accent is compensated by its connection with the long note. This view has been criticised by Schläger,² who doubts whether this modus can be recognized in the early notation. He thinks also that an accent on a short note shows a separation of the musical notation from the text. The same belief is expressed by Riemann,³ namely, that if the second modus had existed in early times, it would have conformed to the word-rhythm and become the eight syllable variety of the first modus.

It is not my purpose here to go into a discussion of these theories, but whether or not Beck's idea is ultimately accepted, it is interesting to consider one of the poems, which he cites as an example of this genuine French rhythm. Furthermore, the poem itself is an unusually charming and graceful composition, and its musical accompaniment is singularly appropriate. Beck publishes only the first two lines in his large volume,⁴ but in a short article in the *Riemann Festschrift*⁵ he prints the first stanza entire together with the notation.

The poem in question is found in three manuscripts: Bib. Nat. 846, 847 and Nouv. Ac. 1050. Raynaud gives a brief description of these manuscripts.⁶ All three are of the thirteenth century and in all of them the writing is quite distinct. Except for considerable orthographical differences the three versions of the poem present few variants. For convenience in comparing the manuscripts I shall designate 846 by A, 847 by B, and

1050 Nouv. Ac. by C. B and C have many orthographic resemblances, which separate them from A. C is inferior in the text, as II 1, where C omits *mes*; III 1, A B *sa*, C *da*; IV 5, A B *crou*, C *croi*; V 5, A B *foles*, C *foloies*; the latter form is impossible for the metre; this is also true in V 8, *carele*, where A B have *quele*. A and B are almost equally good. B is to be preferred in IV 2, where A repeats *erien* from III 2. A is better in II 1 and V 1, *mes cuers* for *mon cuer*; II 8, A *soz*, B *sor*; IV 7, A *dur*, B *du*. Therefore in publishing the text I have followed A rather than B or C, but have given the variants for all except purely orthographic differences. It is also from A that Beck printed the stanza above mentioned.

The second poem offers a pleasing contrast to the vigorous, impressive melody of the first. Its plaintive delicacy and its musical setting naturally suggest comparison with the well-known song of the 'Flajolet': 'En mai quant li rossignolet,' for the melodies of both belong to the second class of the first modus; i. e., where the first syllable of the verse falls on a short note. The graceful charm and fitting melody of this second song make it a particularly suitable companion piece to 'Apris ai.' Both are anonymous, which probably accounts for the fact that neither has been published before. The second is found in only one manuscript, Bib. Nat. 846,⁸ fol. 51a.

VERSIFICATION. The first song consists of five strophes of eight verses each and a refrain of two verses:

7a 5b 7a 5b 7a 5b ! 7C 7C
((((

The rhyme changes with each strophe. The second song has five strophes of eight verses and an envoi of four verses. It does not have any refrain:

8a 6b 8a 6b 8a 6b 8a 8a.
((((

Strophe II has the same rhymes as strophe I, and strophe IV the same as strophe III. The rhymes of the envoi correspond to the last four lines of strophe V.

² Beck, l. c., p. 117, prints the first stanza and notation for this song.

³ Beck, l. c., p. 117, prints the first stanza of this song, together with the musical notation. Cf. also p. 193, where he speaks of its literary quality.

⁴ LBl., 1909, pp. 282-289. Cf. E. Stengel, *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, xxxv, pp. 156-161.

⁵ *Die Erschliessung des Melodienschatzes der Troubadours und Trouvères*; Max Hesse's *Deutscher Musik-Kalender*, 1909, 136 ff.

⁶ Beck, l. c., p. 124.

⁷ Leipzig, 1909. Also in *La Musique des Troubadours* (Paris, 1910), p. 84.

⁸ *Bibliographie des Chansonniers Français*, Vol. 1, pp. 110 f., 123, and 201.

- I Apri ai qu'en chantant plour
Plus qu'en nule guise ;
Pour abatre ma dolour
Que si me justise,
5 Cent sopirs fais chascun jor,
C'est ma rente assise ;
Et le bien que j'ai d'amours,
C'est par mon servise.
Chascuns dit que je foloi,
Mais nuns nel set mieuz de moi.
- II Mes cuers a raison et droit,
S'en li met m'entente,
Car a chascun qui la voit
Plait et atalente.
5 Nuns n'en dit bien qui n'i soit,
Ne mal qu'il ne mente.
Gariz iert qui la tendroit
En chambre ou soz ente.
Chascuns dit que je foloi,
Mais nuns nel set mieuz de moi.
- III Sa hautece et son vis cler
Crien, ou trop se fie.
Las ! el ne mi vuet amer,
S'el ne s'en troble.
5 Trop a en moi poure per
A si bele amie,
Mais ce me fait conforter
Qu'amors n'eslit mie.
Chascuns dit que je foloi,
Mais nuns nel set mieuz de moi.
- IV Mout la pris et mout la lo.
Qu'el n'en soit plus fiere !
Avis m'est que j'en di pou,
Tant l'a mes cuers chiere.
5 Bien voi que trop haut m'encrou,
Mais mout vaut proiere.
Aigue perce dur chaillou,
Por qu'ades i fiere.
Chascuns dit que je foloi,
Mais nuns nel set mieuz de moi.
- V Mes cuers ne me fait nul bien,
Fors poinne et damage ;
Ja nou verrai lige mien
En tout mon aage.
5 Cuers, tu foles. Car t'en tien !
Or ai dit outrage,
Mes ser la sor toute rien
Qu'ele est prouz et saige.
Chascuns dit que je foloi,
Mais nuns nel set mieuz de moi.

VARIANTS.—I : 3, A ma, BC la ; 4, A que, BC qui.—II : 1, A mes cuers, B mon cuer, C cuers ; 2, AB met, C ment ; A mentente, BC sentente. 6, A quil, BC qui ; AC ne, B nen. 8, A soz, B sor, C souz.—III : 1, AB sa, C da ; 4, AC sen, B men ; 1, AC me, B mi.—IV : 2, A crien,

repeated from III 2 ; 3, A ie, B ien, C gen ; A doi, BC di ; A uoi, BC sai ; 5, AB crou, C croi ; 7, AC dur, B du. —v : 1, AC mes cuers, B mon cuer ; 5, AC cuers, B car ; AB foles, C foloies ; A cor ten tieng, B car ten tien, C car ten ten ; 8, AB quele, C carele.

- I En la douce saison d'estey,
Que renverdist la fueille,
Ai amoreusement chantei,
Coment que je m'en dueille.
J'ai un fin cuer desmesuré
Qu'en bien amer s'orgueille.
S'a son outrage en læautey
Et en fine amour assamblé.
- II Je requier ma dame por deu,
Qu'en pitié me recuille
Et s'aucun bien m'avoit doné
Qu'ele nou me retuille ;
Q'ou mont n'a honor ne bonté
Ne riens que je plus vuille,
Fors que vivre à sa volonté
Et que l'amasse par son gré.
- III Sui biau paller, sui acointier,
Sa douce compagnie
Me feront penser et veillier
Toz les jors de ma vie ;
Et me font de mes maus cuidier
Biens, et sens de folie.
Je n'en puis garir ne ne quier :
Or, pant dex dou rasoagier !
- IV J'atent ma joie à grant dongier,
Ploins d'esmai et d'envie ;
Ne raisons ne me puet aidier,
Se pitiez ne m'ahie.
Dame cui j'aing sanz losengier,
Por deu ne vos griet mie,
Se de merci vos os proier,
C'onques de rien n'oi tel mestier.
- V Bien voi que ma dame ne chaut
De rien fors dou destroindre ;
Quant plus m'a conquis, plus m'asaut,
Ne n'en puis tote ataindre ;
Tant à son voloir me travaut
Et lait plorer et plaindre.
Je l'amerai coment qu'il m'aut ;
Helas ! j'aing bien, mais pou mi vaut.
- VI Hugues compains, se dex me saut,
J'aing læaument sanz faindre ;
Si c'uns soulds poinz d'amors n'i faut,
Se ce n'est cil, que j'aing trop haut.

RAYMOND T. HILL.

Yale University.

DR. JOSEPH WEBBE AND LANGUAGE
TEACHING (1622).

I. GRAMMAR AS A HINDRANCE TO LEARNING
LATIN.

The great Grammar War of the seventeenth century was concerned with the dispute: Shall Latin be taught as a living language, or through the grammar? The advantage of the grammar-method was that uniformity of procedure was secured throughout the schools. "To make pupils perfect in an ordinary Grammar," says Philoponus in Brinsley's *Ludus literarius*, "by the use whereof alone so many excellent scholars have been; then they will be sure to go forward in any school or course, and to be well liked by every one." But every one admitted that this was a long, tiresome, repellant course. The argument in its favour was that if slow, it was sure, though its opponents doubted even this certainty. Montaigne's experience (1533-1592) is almost a *locus classicus* on method:

"I being at nurse and before I had the use of my tongue was delivered to a German, who could not speak a word of French but was very ready and skilful in the Latin. This man whom my father procured for that purpose, and to whom he allowed a very considerable salary had me continually in his arms and was my only overseer. There were also two of his countrymen appointed for his assistants, but much inferior to him in learning, whose business it was to attend me; but all they spoke was the Latin tongue. As for others of the family, it was an inviolable rule with my father, that neither himself nor my mother, nor man nor maid servant were suffered to speak one word in my company except such Latin phrases as every one had learned to chat and prattle with me. It was strange to tell how every one in the family profited therein: my father and mother learned it, and the household servants who were near my person understood it, when spoken. In brief we were all Latinised, so that the neighbouring villages had their share of it; insomuch that at this day, many Latin names both of workmen and their tools are yet in use among them."

Similar conditions are described by Sir Thomas Elyot in England and by the Stephenses in France also in the sixteenth century. The common factor is the creation of an environment, in which spoken

Latin is acquired in the same way as the vernacular. This is not unreasonable, seeing that the mother-tongue is, in the first instance, a foreign language, and the method of its acquisition is clearly the natural method. But whilst all the elements of an environment are promptly and continuously at hand for the child in his progress in the mother-tongue, they have to be provided for the child to put him into the same advantageous position for acquiring a foreign language, or else, and better for this purpose, the child must be transplanted for a sufficient time to the foreign country itself, where the natural process of acquisition becomes substantially the same as for the vernacular, with this difference, that he now has the vernacular as a basis (unconscious it may be) for comparison—in words, accidence, and construction of sentences.

Now the creation of an atmosphere in which a foreign language shall be acquired (apart from the country in which that language is the vernacular) is, in any complete degree, difficult and expensive. Accordingly in the instances to which I have referred, Montaigne, Elyot, the Stephenses, there were present, first of all, a considerable degree of culture in the parents and, secondly, resources to provide the necessary environment. The problem has always been far more difficult when school-classes have been considered. But there have always been educationists who have refused to treat the subject of Latin-teaching on any other principles than those of the teaching of a modern foreign language.

One of the most noteworthy of these advocates in England in the seventeenth century is a man whose name now is scarcely known—that of Dr. Joseph Webbe. Dr. Webbe was a physician, an M. D. and Ph. D. of some foreign university. As a physician in 1612 he wrote an astrological treatise, *Minæ Coelestes Affectus aegrotantibus denunciatis*, which was published at Rome. Like many of the physicians of that time, he pursued literary studies, and especially was drawn to the subject of classical education. In 1623, he was residing in the Old Bailey in London. In 1622, he wrote *An Appeale to Truth*, advocating the minimising, if not abolition, of Grammar-methods in teaching languages and in 1623, he wrote his *Petition to Parliament*, asking for a patent to be

allowed to use his method of direct teaching of languages, to the exclusion of its use by other teachers. About 1620, Webbe had published his translations of the *Familiar Epistles* of M. T. Cicero. As this was one of the earliest books put in the hands of Latin pupils, it is clear that though Webbe advocated the conversational method of teaching Latin, he also required the pupil concurrently to begin reading Latin, though no Grammatical text-book was to be employed. Webbe wanted to do for England what Dolet and Manutius had done respectively for France and Italy, in translating Cicero's *Familiar Epistles*. He tells us he has carefully borne in mind Horace's precept in translation :

Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus
Interpres.

He thus describes his aims in translation :

"Lest I might err with that English Gentleman who being demanded by an Italian what was become of his foot-boy made answer : '*Ha preso i suoi calcagni.*' Which sounded almost as well to the Italian, as this other to an Englishman, from the mouth of a great traveller, who being asked, when he saw his friend, replied : '*It maketh a little that he was here.*' Both these answers, as many of the like, though they have good words, yet for the sense, being word for word translated, the first is but *English-Italian*, the last *Italian-English*. Which how far they are different from the purity of speech, in either language, let their Boccaccio and our Sir Philip [Sidney] teach us. Keeping therefore, sense for sense ; lest I might offend mine own language, or wrong mine Author, I have endeavoured, within the compass of my capacity, to give thee some, though not all manner of satisfaction. For not alone the profit of younglings is to be respected ; but theirs also, that are desirous to read matters of history, negotiations, war, and secret passages of policy, and government ; of which these little books are full : as being written by the greatest wit, and most industrious and frequent Orator, in the weightiest businesses and quickest times of the Roman Commonwealth."

The writer on Webbe in the *Dictionary of National Biography* states that John Gee in his *Foot out of the snare*, 1623 (a book holding up the Catholics to contempt, naming all the Catholic authors of the time known to him), describes Dr. Webbe as residing in the "Old Bailey" [Lon-

don] where "he pretendeth to teach a new gain way to learn languages"—and then follows the insinuation,—“and by this occasion may inveigle disciples.”

It must be confessed that Dr. Webbe in attempting to pursue the career of a teacher in London weighted himself very heavily by being a physician, an astrologer, and a Roman Catholic, in 1623, and then as a teacher, running the gauntlet of all the conservative grammar-teachers, who acknowledged the supremacy of Lily as the authoritative Grammar, and were ordered by the King's proclamation, both to use that Grammar and "no other." Here was a physician—astrologer—Roman Catholic—non-teacher, presuming to suggest that he should have a patent for a method that ignored both Lily and the whole race of professional teachers.

Webbe's first tractate on the subject is entitled *An Appeale to Truth* (1622). He begins by pointing out that "grammatica" amongst the ancient Romans was not used to teach the Latin language for the simple reason that the language was their own already. The subject was what we should call letter-knowledge, and could only correspond to our ABC Primers, horn-books and the like. Grammar had a place amongst the Liberal Arts, but "neither it nor any of the rest can teach the languages."

No doubt the antiquity of grammar is great. But we must keep a wary outlook on it, lest it "trifle away our time, frustrate our labours, disable ourselves and wrong the ends of our intentions. For neither hath the name proportion with the thing, nor the thing with what it promiseth." It would be easy to cite the numerous instances in which grammarians have exposed one another's defects and errors, but this is a commonplace. It is more to the purpose to cite a modern schoolmaster, Thomas Haine, whom Webbe describes as "one of the most sufficient schoolmasters about this city of London." Haine, it appears, had written a Latin discourse to the same effect as Webbe's *Appeale*. In this tractate he held that some grammarians had been *minimum diligentes* and that they fell "within the compass of Quintilian's complaint against such as *plura quam par sit dicunt, non tamen omnia* (say more than they ought and yet not all they should)." Haine went

on to assert that grammarians enriched themselves with the spoil of lexicons and other arts, and adorned their plumes with filched feathers. "When they have done what they can, they do but break young scholars' backs with the burden of unnecessary precepts, and that setting their tender wits upon the rack, they pull and tear them with tautologies."

Of course, such quotations as the above from Haine and much of what Webbe has to say himself are rather protests against the over-elaborations of grammars, than against simple text-books of grammar, but Webbe maintains that great critics not only condemn the grammarians, but have brought the keenest criticism to bear on the art of grammar in itself. "For," says Webbe,

"In following grammar we abandon elegance and the pleasure of the ear, and speak and write Grammar-Latin, English-Latin, Dutch-Latin, French-Latin, and in a word every nation by this art writes its own peculiar Latin and not the Latin of the Latins, nor any foreign language as it should be. For in every tongue there are many things, which if we should utter by any other order than as they are vulgarly spoken, they would not run well and we should be thought to speak improperly; as every man may judge by the clauses, sentences, and especially proverbs of his own language, which transposed or made up with other words then common, would for the most part lose their pleasing grace, delightful sound, and (many times) their sense and meaning."

After quoting Ascham to show that grammar-study leads to bad Latin composition and hindrance of the understanding of the poets, he continues:

"Many of the Master-grammarians," says Haloinus, (which lost no time, either in writing of Grammar, or in teaching it) have been so far from perfection in their own profession that they were neither able to speak Latin rightly, nor to write it with elegance. Further, we may note a number of their scholars which have taken infinite pains till twenty years of age, sometimes till thirty, and yet are not able to write or speak any thing worth the reading: nor have they any knowledge in other arts or professions: though they have suffered many stripes, and are almost deaf with cries and exclamations.

"Grammar is not an end in itself, and cannot of itself make us speak correctly. As Montaigne says:

"There are that know neither Ablative, Con-junctive, Substantive, nor Grammar; no more than doth their Lackey, nor any Oyster-wife about the streets; and yet if you have a mind thereto they will entertain you your fill, and per-adventure stumble as little and as seldom against the rules of their tongue, as the best Master of Arts in France. And,' saith he, 'I hate such as can brag of their rules of Grammar, and can neither write nor speak a language'; and so do others. 'Nay,' saith he, 'I find the choicest men were they that most condemned rules.'

"What, then, can be put in place of Grammar?

"If we ask Quintilian . . . he will tell us plainly that custom is the best Schoolmistress for languages, and that all the Latins were taught by use and custom, from the mouths of nurses and other women, which had the keeping of them, from their cradle; and not by Grammar as Gram-mar-ians."

Montaigne, we have seen, learned Latin by speaking it, not by Grammar, and Webbe quotes the passage in full from Montaigne's *Essays* (Bk. I, cap. 25):

"This method of learning languages had," Webbe continues, such "authority with Ludovicus Vives, that he confesseth he had rather be thus employed for one year, than to bestow ten years to this purpose under the best and most reputed schoolmasters."

Having treated of Grammar as the basis of adulterate Latin, Webbe makes his appeal to Truth:

"But notwithstanding all these reasons, all these experiments, all these grave and weighty testimonies; I doubt not, but I shall hear of some Demetrius, who with his Associates, to keep up the trade, will still be crying, *Magna Diana Ephesiorum*."

"Wherefore, I appeal to thee, my Defendress, and to thy Tribunal, most humbly imploring no other redress of injurious oppressions, but that the presence of thy self, O Truth, may be so much respected, that blindfold opinion, Patroness of Grammar and Grammarians, may cease to govern and to keep the people (as herself is) hood-winked: And that, upon thy straight and imperial Command, she may leave all men indifferent, and in the posture of an equal balance, ready to turn, where reason, sense and demonstration are most ponderous.

"And the waking part of Students shall not only acknowledge thy divine and powerful hand in the cure of their deplored lethargy: but myself,

thy devote suppliant, in lieu thereof shall be obliged in my next endeavours, to discover in what manner this Use, Custom, and Authority should be fought and ordered, for the speedy, cheap, and infallible furnishing of this, and every other Nation with all sorts of purest Languages."

II. LATIN-LATIN.

Dr. Joseph Webbe in his *Appeale* to "the sole Governess of his best endeavours," viz. Truth, is convinced of the idolatry, which has been paid to "Grammar-Latin" as he calls it and suggests as substitute what he graphically calls, in contradistinction to Grammar-Latin, Latin-Latin. The late Mr. W. H. Widgery in his *Teaching of Languages in Schools* is the only writer of whom I know, who has, in modern times, shown any recognition of Webbe, and he suggests that Webbe's tractates on language-teaching are worthy of reprint. Mr. Widgery was the earnest advocate of the idea of the sentence, not the word, as the unit in language-teaching. Joseph Webbe would have accepted Widgery's suggestion that the ordinary grammar-method trains the idea in children "that languages are built up mosaic-like out of paradigms and syntax rules, a view diametrically opposed to the truth."

Dr. Webbe had an alternative method to propose. He called it the Latin-Latin method. This, in short, is the method of picking up, in the course of instruction, the Grammar from Latin authors themselves instead of from grammarians. Languages can only be acquired by "the custom and use of speaking them." He therefore expounds this system in a further tractate which takes the form of a petition to Parliament for a patent for his method of teaching Latin. This contains a full account of possible objections to his system and an answer to each objection which, as far as he can anticipate, could be urged. The tractate is entitled, in full: *A Petition to the High Court of Parliament, In the behalf of auncient and authentique Authors, for the universal and perpetuall good of every man and his posteritie: Presented by Joseph Webbe, Dr. in Ph. Printed 1623.*

Grammar-Latin and Latin-Latin. Dr. Webbe quotes Quintilian: *Aliud est grammaticæ, aliud Latine loqui*: and continues:

"There are two sorts of Latin, whereof one is Grammar-Latin and the other Latin-Latin. By Latin-Latin I mean such as the best approved Authors wrote, and left us in their books and monuments of use and custom. By Grammar-Latin I understand that Latin that we now make by Grammar rules: the first intention of which rules, and their collection out of that custom and those Authors, was, to make us write and speak such Latin as that Custom and those Authors did; which was Latin-Latin: but it succeeded not."

Webbe's Petition. "Wherefore my Petition is to this high Court of Parliament (not that Grammar should be questioned, in that it is our old acquaintance, and hath a long time been a ledger [lodger?] here amongst us, on the behalf of these Authors; but, considering it is not able to give us Authors' Latin) that these Authors, whom we seem to have so much respected in our Schools and Universities, coming themselves as it were in person, and offering to dwell amongst us, may to their deserved honour and our desired benefit, be now received, priviledged and admitted to tell their own tales, and teach us their own Latin."

Dr. Webbe wishes a Patent for his Method of Language teaching:

"This admittance of theirs, have I these eighteen years continued, and these five last years seriously solicited, and cannot as yet find any way to compass it, without manifest danger of ruining myself and mine assistants, unless by favour of this high and honorable Court I may be allowed father of mine own children, and Author of mine own work and inventions: that is, that no one else may print them or import them: nor any man teach languages by that method that I propose, but such as I think fitting; and that these priviledges may continue for the space of 21 years after the publication of every book of this nature that shall be published within the term of years before specified; with prohibition that no man shall hereafter, during that time, attempt the same way in any other Author or Language, without my special allowance."

Answers to objections to his Methods.

1. "It might be thought a great presumption and arrogancy in me to attribute so much unto myself, as to set upon a new-found thing, that for so many ages, and amongst so infinite a number of learned men was never hitherto reflected on; and therefore much to be suspected and demurred upon."

Webbe states that he has already shown in his *Appeale to Truth* that his method has existed "since speaking was, which was long before Grammar and is where no Grammar ever came."

2. It is objected: "That though the general way by custom and authority might be intimated by these Authors, yet I could not excuse myself of presumption in the course I took unto it in particular."

Webbe answers: "But as for that which is built upon this groundwork [of Cicero, etc.] for the peculiar use of every man, and the bringing of that into act, which these grave men have given us hitherto but to contemplate: that (without presumption) I call mine; as the pipe of lead calls the water which it conveys to many cisterns; always acknowledging the waters of all true understanding to proceed only from the eternal fountain of all wisdom my Creator."

3. He is asked: "Are you sure you know what you promise? Is it possible to learn Latin without a Grammar?"

Answer: "It is not possible to learn Grammar-Latin without Grammar; but it is possible to learn Latin-Latin (that is, the Latin that was in use among the ancient Latins) without Grammar."

Webbe next writes a strong passage ("That that's more than ten Quintilians"). "For recte scribendi atque loquendi ars must run along with the custom and use of speaking that was observed by those ancient Authors: which I must confess the vulgar Grammar arriveth at, or else it should want all colour and authority: but Quintilian, and that that's more than ten Quintilians, the very practice tells us, it hitteth not the mark of writing rightly. God is my record, I speak not this to deprive Grammar of her scholars, (for she hath her own worth, and according unto it should be respected) but my humble Petition is, that the old authentic Authors and chief Lords of language, our best and sincerest friends, may not be thrust out of their own patrimony, by those whose chiefest grace it is to be thought their followers."

4. Webbe is asked for proofs of his system of the possibility of learning Latin-Latin.

He answers, "The grounds of speech are laid in things, in the meanings of which things all tongues meet. Therefore as they are all the meanings of things, so they are all the meanings of one another. But one word does not correspond to another word, a second to a second and so on—e. g. though in

Italian *un* = an; *cavallo*, horse; *di*, of; *buon*, good; *metallo*, metal; and 'A horse of good metal' put together be good English yet the Italian understands not, *un cavallo di buon metallo* to be Italian, but disclaims it." Use and custom alone determine, not the Grammar and Dictionary.

5. It is said: "Authority cannot afford members for all senses." If there is no authority, pleads Webbe, how come such sentences to be translated by grammar-Latin? If necessary, he will print a *supplement* to his Authors, to include some few names of things which fall not within the discourses of his Authors.

6. Then he is asked: "Where are these Authors reduced to your Method, and where is that Supplement?"

He objects to being required to produce them unless he has privileges granted him: "I should not be urged to a greater inconvenience, (as to bestow yet other four or five hundred pounds) to produce that, which when it is produced, gives me no more assurance of a privilege, than at this present."

7. Then it was objected: "That his Majesty [James I] had already confirmed a Patent granted for the teaching of Grammar, and would admit no other course of teaching."

Whereupon Webbe demands: "What hindrance is the Goldsmiths' privilege to the Braziers?" "I desire not," he continues, "the suppression or hindrance of Grammar, but the purity of Latin. Again, this Grammar was privileged to forbid all other Grammars: but I seek not to introduce another Grammar, except we shall very improperly call it *Cicero's Grammar*. My desire is only, that such as are weary, and would not, or can no longer go by Grammar, or are not desirous of Grammar-Latin, might be admitted to an easy and profitable use of Authors, and to these Authors' own way of teaching their own Language without Grammar."

8. Asked for proof of his Method, Webbe answers that he has a "twofold proof: one, of a power that these books bring to any man, the first day to write rightly by them: and another, of this power reduced by exercise to an habit of writing rightly without them."

9. If you take clauses out of Authors, and think of the meaning of the whole, how do you

know what each word signifies? Besides it is stealing.

Answer: Construing word for word is impossible in any language, *e. g.*, in the barbarous English of the Frenchman, "I you pray, sir" for *je vous prie, Monsieur*. "Wherefore I had rather a scholar should remember the natural and received position of a clause by keeping the words always all together, than understand the particular correspondence of the words, and thereby lose their proper places. For discretion and comparison of clause with clause will at length bring the understanding of the words whether we will or no; but nothing will bring the true position of these words again, by reason that our own tongue doth therein still misguide us, and makes us always to be distinguished for strangers, even in our very writing.

"Other demands and objections less material, as not touching the thing itself, but some particular and by-respects would clog your ears with more than becomes a modest brevity. Wherefore leaving them, till some further occasion offer[s]; and most humbly entreating you to cast a favourable eye on this Petition, I in all obedience dedicate myself, my labour, and the rest of my life, in the full extent of my whole talent, to the eternal glory of my God, to the loyal service I owe unto my Sovereign and his succession, and to the future good of you and your posterity."

In spite of the much greater renown of Montaigne, Roger Ascham, John Amos Comenius, and John Milton on questions of teaching the languages, it is doubtful whether any of them saw more clearly than Joseph Webbe, in these two tractates, the *Appeale to Truth* and his *Petition to Parliament*, the essence of the problems of language-teaching. In the seventeenth century it was still open to argue that Latin should be regarded as a spoken, a living language. For scholars and diplomats still used Latin as a means of communication. I have shewn elsewhere that in England the decadence of the cultivation of Latin as a *spoken* language set in with the growing necessity of learning French. This period did not begin with the Restoration-attraction towards French led by the Court, but it was intensified by it. In the Commonwealth period, royalist refugees of the best families were in France bringing up their children with Huguenot pastors as teachers; and in cultivated homes in England, it was a common-place that some of the most learned and attractive works (not in Latin) were in French. When French

became used as the diplomatic language and had a splendid literature of scholarly works, Latin tended to cease to remain the international language and accordingly ceased to be taught as a living language. Hence, the writing of exercises and the learning of grammar were glorified, and became traditional. Accordingly the plea of an approximation of the teaching of Latin to that of French gave the suggestion of the direct method of learning Latin as a retrograde movement. Both Webbe and the method for which he stood became obscured and obsolete in England in the later part of the seventeenth century. Some years after Webbe's *Appeale to Truth*, viz. in 1644, the Jansenist, Claude Lancelot, published the *Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre facilement et en peu de tems la langue Latine* or, as it was called, *The Port Royal Latin Grammar*. Dr. Beard says, "This was the first instance in which the attempt was made to teach a dead through the medium of a living language." But Webbe's *Appeale to Truth*, in England, twenty-two years earlier than Lancelot, was both prior in time, and more thoroughgoing, in that it dispensed with a grammatical textbook, and suggested that Latin should be learned through Latin authors helped out by explanations in the vernacular, but the help to be given should be directed to the understanding of the Latin, clause by clause and not word by word. It is, however, important to bear in mind the name of Lancelot and the Port-Royalists in France, for it shows that the recognition was all the more general, in the first half of the seventeenth century, that Latin could not be effectively taught by the old grammar-methods and that the need of more rational instruction in Latin was experienced by various reformers without intercommunication of any kind.

To be carefully distinguished from Joseph Webbe, is George Webbe. There are two reasons which make this difficult. They are both "Dr. Webbe" and they both wrote books illustrating method of Latin teaching, and their method of teaching were similar. Dr. George Webbe was born in 1588, and died in 1641. He was admitted scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1598. He became minister of Steeple Ashton in Wiltshire, taught grammar there, and subsequently taught grammar at Bath. In 1634 he became Bishop of Limerick.

His educational books were :

1. *Pueriles Confabulationculae; or, Children's Talk.* 1627.
2. *Lessons and Exercises out of Cicero ad Atticum.* 1627.
3. *The first Comedy of Pub. Terentius called Andria and The Second Comedy of Pub. Terentius called Eunuchus.* 1629.

Wood (*Athen. Oxon.*, Vol. iii, col. 30) says of the last-named "both very useful for school-boys and are yet used, as his two former school-books are, in many schools." By George Webbe's method the text of Terence was broken up systematically on a method similar to that of modern "analysis" of sentences. He entitled his treatment the Clausulary Method.

It is difficult, I have said, to keep Joseph Webbe and George Webbe separate in one's mind, especially as the clausulary method seems to be advocated by both. The following passage from John Webster probably confuses the two writers, though the latter part of the quotation seems definitely to refer to the would-be patentor of the direct method of Latin-teaching,

"Much to be commended, therefore, was the enterprise of Doctor Web [= Webbe] who found out a more short, certain and easy way to teach the Latin tongue in, than the tedious, painful, intricate and hard way of Grammar, and that by a brief and easy Clausulary Method, in far shorter time to attain perfection therein, and if it had been well followed and improved, would have produced an incredible advantage to the whole nation; but we are in this like tradesmen, who all bandy and confederate together to suppress any new invention though never so commodious to the Commonwealth, lest thereby their own private gain should be obstructed or taken away."—*Academiæ Examens.* By John Webster, 1654.

Dr. Joseph Webbe also wrote *Usus et authoritas id est, liber feliciter incipit, sub titulo Enthæati materialis primi hexametra et pentametra, etc.* Londini, 1626. 12mo.

FOSTER WATSON.

University College of Wales.

OLD NORSE NOTES.

I. A SECOND OCCURRENCE OF THE FAITHLESS WIFE MOTIF IN OLD NORSE.

In the introduction to an edition of the *Hálfs saga*,¹ while discussing the episode related in Chap. 8, the Old Norse representative of a widely spread tale of a faithless wife, I have given expression to the commonly held belief that there is no other trace of this tale in Old Norse literature. My friend, Dr. C. N. Gould of Chicago University, has, however, since called my attention to another anecdote of this character, which ought to be recorded.

In the *Göngu-Hrólfs saga*, an interesting Icelandic work presumably of the fourteenth century,² it is related that Ingibjörg, the wife of Björn, Jarl Þorgny's councillor, was seduced by a certain Mondull Pattason, and further that the faithless conduct of the wife was perpetrated under the eyes of her husband ("Birni ásjáanda"). Björn was bound hand and foot (p. 307) and was to be hanged, a result of the machinations of Mondull, who had brought him into disfavor with the Jarl and among other things made him appear guilty of theft of the latter's valuable belt, the gift of Mondull. For the rest it appears that Mondull is a dwarf and that he has employed magic means to secure the affection of Björn's wife (she becomes black and swollen as a result of this magic and is restored to her normal condition by the application of a magic ointment and the drinking of a remembrance-potion, *minnisveig*). The rescuer of Björn is none other than Göngu-Hrólfr, who compels the dwarf to free Björn, release Ingibjörg from the spell and restore to their proper place and function Hrólfr's severed feet. All this Mondull does and disappears, to return afterwards, however (p. 316 ff.), and render Hrólfr further assistance.

The essential situation of this tale,³ viz., the helpless husband, perforce an eye-witness to his wife's infidelity, is then here preserved; the other features are mostly taken from the Icelandic su-

¹ *Altnordische Sagabibliothek*, Heft 14. Halle, 1909, p. 19.

² *Fornaldarsögur Norðrlanda*, ed. Rafn, III, p. 298 ff.

³ Cf. Antoniewicz, *Anz. f. deutsch. Altert.*, XIV, 245, 1888.

perstitutions relative to dwarfs and the whole loosely incorporated in the narrative of Hrólfr.⁴

II. SIGURÐAKVIÐA EN SKAMMA 12.

This strophe reads in Gering's edition of the Eddic poems⁵:

<i>Lǫtum sun fara</i>	<i>feþr í sinni,</i>
<i>skalat ulf ala</i>	<i>ungan lengi ;</i>
<i>hveim verþr holþa</i>	<i>hefnd létari</i>
<i>síþan til sátta,</i>	<i>at sunr lífi.</i>

The general meaning of the strophe is perfectly clear: Brynhildr having in the previous strophe urged her husband to kill Sigurðr, suggests in these lines that the latter's young son be also put out of the way, lest he later take vengeance for his father's death.

Into this strophe Gering has admitted but one textual emendation, viz., the addition of the negative suffix *t* to the *lifi* of *Codex regius*, an emendation originating with Svend Grundtvig⁶ and accepted by Finnur Jónsson,⁷ by Bugge,⁸ and by Sijmons.⁹ The Grimm brothers retained the reading *lifi* of the Codex, punctuating at the end with an interrogation point,¹⁰ which interpretation a variety of editors have followed since.¹¹ That none of these readings is satisfactory¹² is apparent enough to one attempting to read the strophe and is acknowledged by Sijmons.¹³

While reading this poem the feeling that the context required *síþr* rather than *síþan* led me to

consult the phototypic edition of *Codex regius*,¹⁴ where I found *síþ'*, which in this ms. is the common abbreviation for *síþan* and *síþr*.¹⁵ This abbreviation has in several places of the Edda been resolved differently by different editors,¹⁶ and in fact in our strophe Rask¹⁷ has read *síþr*, though his reading appears to have remained unnoticed since and is not included in Gering's variant-apparatus. Rask's punctuation, especially the interrogation point at the end of the strophe, does not, however, correspond with my interpretation, and I trust it will not be superfluous again to call attention to the strophe. *Síþr* is metrically preferable to *síþan*, giving a regular tetrasyllabic half-verse of A-type, while it gives, without textual emendations of any sort, the meaning required by the context.

The last two verses would then read:

<i>hveim verþr holþa</i>	<i>hefnd létari,</i>
<i>síþr til sátta,</i>	<i>at sunr lífi.</i>

And the meaning of the strophe would be: "Let us send the son along with the father, one should not long foster the young wolf; vengeance upon any man is easier and he has less chance of reconciliation, as long as the son (of the man he has killed) still lives."¹⁸

III. THE RELATION OF *Völuspá* TO *Baldrs draumar*.

The short Eddic poem, *Baldrs draumar* (also called *Vegtamskviða*), was not included in the Eddic *Codex regius*, but is preserved in the considerably later ms. *AM* 748, 4°. As to the age of the poem itself there is general disagreement among Norse scholars, only a small minority claiming for it any considerable degree of an-

⁴ In speaking of the Sanskrit version of this tale (*Háls saga*, p. 18), I have misstated the source, which is Somadeva Bhatta's *Kathāsaritsāgara* (ed. Durgaprasād & Parab, Bombay, 1889, p. 366 f.; translated by C. H. Tawney, Calcutta, 1880-84 [*Bibliotheca Indica*], II, p. 53 f.); the Pancatantra-story (IV, 5, ed. Hertel, Cambridge, 1908 [= *Harvard Oriental Series*, 11] 244 ff.), is at best but remotely related.

⁵ *Lieder der älteren Edda*, Paderborn, 1904, p. 346 f.

⁶ *Scemundar Edda*, Kbh. 1868, p. 128.

⁷ *Eddalieder*, II, p. 55, Halle, 1890; he emended further *hefnd* to *hēnd*.

⁸ *PBBetr.* XXII, 119 f., 1897; Bugge also approved of Jónsson's emendation of *hefnd* to *hond*.

⁹ *Lieder der Edda*, p. 369, Halle, 1901.

¹⁰ *Lieder der alten Edda*, Berlin, 1815, p. 246.

¹¹ For list cf. Gering's critical apparatus, I. c.

¹² And the further emendation of Vigfússon, *Opb.*, I, 295, does not help the matter.

¹³ L. c. in apparat.

¹⁴ Curav. Wimmer and Jónsson, Kbh., 1891, p. 68.

¹⁵ Cf. Introduction, p. lii.

¹⁶ Cf. Gering, *Vollständiges Wörterbuch zu den Liedern der Edda*, 1903, pp. 920-922 and the apparatus in Gering's Edda-edition under passages cited.

¹⁷ *Edda Scemundar hinns fróða*, Stockholm, 1818, p. 217.

¹⁸ For *hefna* with dative of person upon whom vengeance is taken cf. Fritzner, *Ordbog*, I, 750, for the construction *hveim verþr síþr til sátta*, at—cf. Fritzner, *op. cit.*, III, 914, with the citation from *Heilagramanna saga*, ed. Unger, Christiania, 1877, II, 44, *þeir ugþo—, at þeim myndi nekkvet til meins verða, ef þeir görði þat.* (*nekkvet* is here adverbial like *síþr*).

tiquity. Of this minority Finnur Jónsson formerly regarded it¹⁹ as one of the oldest of its kind and even accepted a conjecture of Vigfússon,²⁰ that it was by the same author as the *Þrymskviða*, though he has evidently since given up the latter idea and speaks less positively of the poem's age.²¹ Mogk, on the other hand, who recognizes its close relation to the *Völuspá*, regards it as of later origin than, and in fact dependent upon, the latter.²² The same idea is developed more in detail by Neckel.²³

As the relation between the two poems seems to me rather the reverse of the one suggested by Mogk, I venture to give the reasons for my view. In so far as the current, mostly subjective, criteria for the relative age of the Eddic poems are concerned, Jónsson's judgment makes in this case the greater appeal to me, as the comprehensive and cumbersome *Völuspá* in terms of literary genre is at any rate later than the type of *Baldrs draumar*, which, when all is said and done, is precisely that of the admittedly ancient *Þrymskviða*.

The strophes of *Vsp.* which show practical identity of content with *Bdr.* are 28-34,²⁴ but I am inclined to believe that the whole composition of *Vsp.* was suggested by *Bdr.*, the latter furnishing the idea for a framework to the author's account of *ragnarøk*. The following tabulation of corresponding features in the two poems will serve to demonstrate their unquestionable relationship and can conveniently be made a basis for such deductions as follow therefrom:

<i>Vsp.</i>	<i>Bdr.</i>
The völva is a giantess (str. 2).	The völva is a giantess (str. 13).
When visited by the aged Odin (<i>enn aldni</i>) she is sitting alone in the open air (<i>úti.</i> , str. 23).	The aged Odin (<i>aldenn gautr</i> , str. 2, 13) rides to Nifhel to consult völva; he finds her eastward of Hel's gate, sleeping unprotected from snow, rain and dew (str. 2-5).

¹⁹ *Oldnorske og oldisl. litt. hist.*, I, 147 f., 1894. Cf. also Grundtvig, *Er Nordens gamle Literatur norsk? Hist. Tidskr.*, IV Række, 1, 89 f., 1869.

²⁰ *Corp. poet. bor.*, I, 181, 1883.

²¹ *Isl. litt. hist.*, 1907, p. 48.

²² Paul's *Grundr.*, II, 582, 1904.

²³ *Beiträge zur Eddaforschung*, 1908, p. 59 ff.

²⁴ The numbers of the strophes cited are those of Sijmons' edition, Halle, 1888.

Odin questions her (str. 28) and gives her jewelry in payment for prophecy (str. 30).

She prophesies the death of Baldr and names Høgr as his slayer (str. 32; 33, 1-2), and states further that a son of Odin, one night old, will take vengeance for his death (str. 33, 3-4; 34, 1-2).

Valkyries are mentioned (str. 31) and the mourning of Frigg (str. 34, 3-4).

The völva recognizes Odin apparently by fact that he has but one eye (str. 28, 4; 29).

The episode is followed by a strophe depicting Loki's imprisonment (str. 35). The conclusion of the poem is largely the account of *ragnarøk* and the new age following.

Odin puts 4 questions to her (str. 6, 8, 10, 12).

In answer to Odin's questions the völva prophesies Baldr's death (str. 7), names Høgr as his slayer (str. 9), and states that a son of Odin (Váli?), one night old, will take vengeance (str. 11; str. 11, 2-4 is almost word for word identical with *Vsp.* 33, 4; 34, 1-2).

Odin asks as the 4th question who the maids are that will mourn (str. 12, 3-4), the obvious answer, Valkyries, is lacking.

The völva recognizes Odin apparently by his final question as to the maids that will mourn for Baldr (str. 13, 1-2).

The völva concludes with a threatening allusion to the liberation of Loki and the coming of *ragnarøk*.

This comparison would suggest the following text-criticism of the *Vsp.*: str. 31, 1-2 with str. 34, 3-4 forms a single strophe following str. 34, 1-2; str. 31, 3-6 is an interpolated *pula*, the interpolation suggested by the mention of Valkyries; str. 33 is incomplete, as verses 3-4 certainly do not belong with it; str. 33, 3-4 with str. 34, 1-2 forms, on the other hand, the following complete strophe; str. 35 perhaps does not belong to this episode at all. The original order of strophes of our episode would then have been 28; 29 (?); 30; 32; 33, 1-2; 33, 3-4 + 34, 1-2; 31, 1-2 + 34, 3-4.

With reference to the union of str. 31, 1-2 with str. 34, 3-4, it may be said that the mourning for Baldr played an important part in the old myths connected with his death, and Odin, Frigg and the Valkyries are in the *Gylfaginning* of *Snorra*

Edda expressly associated as mourners,²⁵ which association, so far as Odin and the Valkyries are concerned, goes back to the *Húsdrápa* of Ulfr Uggason, a scaldic poem of the tenth century.²⁶

If the lines are to be thus understood, the *goðbjóðar* of *Cod. reg.* must be interpreted as a collective term for the gods or their home, not as meaning Goths or land of the Goths, as is its common significance in the heroic songs of the *Edda* and of the *Hervarar saga*. Whether in these latter places *Goðbjóð* = "Goths," "land of Goths" be explained as a phonological development from *Gothbjóð*,²⁷ or as due to the influence of words compounded with *goð*,²⁸ the fact remains that both Goths and their country are out of place in *Vsp.* This fact was recognized by Müllenhoff, in that he suggested taking the word (*gotbjóðar*)²⁹ in appellative meaning as applicable to warriors or heroes generally, a meaning justified by no other occurrence and just as much at variance with the context as Goths or their country. The *vitt* of *komnar* applied to Valkyries can only mean "come from far and wide," or at most "come from a distance," and I cannot see why it should not signify that they were assembling from the plying of their vocation for the express purpose of attending Baldr's funeral rites. The idea that the Valkyries are represented here as going out to ply their vocation in mortal battles stands in relation to nothing that precedes or follows; it has by Müllenhoff (l. c.) been strained into accord with an utterly wrong theory of the poem's composition.

Valkyries as an answer to Odin's final question in *Bdr.*, inevitable as it would seem to be, does not agree with a current idea³⁰ that this question must be a riddle. This idea finds its justification through analogy with the final question (which

is, however, itself no riddle!) in *Vafþrúðnismál* and *Heiðreksgátur*, first, in the fact that the *völva* does not answer it, secondly, in the fact that through it she recognizes the identity of the questioner, Odin. Such is, however, not the inevitable conclusion from either fact, since the answer may be lacking because it is so self-apparent not only to the two beings concerned, but also to the poet's Icelandic audience; and, again, the *völva*'s inference that Odin is the questioner may well rest upon the content of the question's self-apparent answer. That is, if it was a characteristic feature of the myth relating to Baldr's funeral that Odin attended accompanied by the Valkyries, as is amply attested by the *Húsdrápa*, an answer to this question was superfluous and the question itself was sufficient to betray the identity of the questioner, as it was meant to do.

The fact seems hardly to have been sufficiently emphasized that *Baldrs draumar* presents in every way an older phase of the Baldr-myth than do these verses of the *Völuspá*; it knows as yet nothing of the mistletoe as the destructive weapon and nothing of Loki's part in bringing about Baldr's death.³¹ It knows only that Baldr was slain by Høpr, who was in turn killed by a son of Odin with Rindr (Váli?), which corresponds in so far entirely with Saxo's version of the same myth.³²

²⁵ The *hróprbarm* of *Bdr.* 9 can in no sense mean the mistletoe, as "most investigators believe" (Neckel, *Beitr. z. Eddaforsch.* p. 61, 1908), but must, however it finally be spelled and explained, from the context refer to Baldr himself (cf. Gering, *Edda-Wörterbuch*, p. 466, Grundtvig, *Er Nordens gamle Litt. norsk?* p. 92 ff., 1869, *Sæmundar Edda*, p. 187, 1868, etc.): *þinir* means "to this place," i. e. to Hel, cf. use of *hér* in str. 7, for use of *berr* cf. *á bál of berr* in str. 11. Neither need the allusion in the last strophe of *Baldrs draumar* to Loki's part in ragnarök and his previous confinement be interpreted as indicating that Loki had played a leading rôle in the death of Baldr, in fact it brings Loki into no necessary relation with the preceding. If it be necessary to seek such relation, it would be most natural to find it in a connection with what most immediately precedes, identifying the *völva* with the mother of the three gigantic beings begotten by Loki, as was done by Bergmann (*Weggewohnts Lied*, Strassburg, 1875, p. 30, 35).

³² It may be noted by the way that the *Vsp.* also need not be interpreted as ascribing to Loki a part in the death of Baldr (cf. Niedner, *Zeitschr. f. deutsches Altert.*, 41, p. 307, 1897), in that its str. 35 does not stand in any neces-

²⁶ *Sn. Ed.*, Hafniae, 1848, I, p. 176.

²⁷ F. Jónsson, *Den norsk-islandske Skjaldedigtning*, I, 1908. A. p. 138, B. p. 129. Cf. Mogk, *PBBetr.*, VII, 289 f., 1880.

²⁸ Heinzel, *Über die Hervarar saga*, Sitz.ber. d. phil.-hist. Cl. d. kaiserl. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien, CXIV, Heft 2. Wien, 1887, p. 490.

²⁹ Noreen, *Altisl. und altnorw. Gram.*, § 240, Anm. 4, 1903.

³⁰ *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, v, p. 111; cf. p. 78, 1883.

³¹ Cf. Bugge, *Studier*, I, 252 ff., 1881. Sijmons, *Lieder der Edda*, 163 in apparat., 1888, etc.

If then *Bdr.* contains in some respects at least more original features of the Baldr-myth than *Vsp.* and the fact of an intimate relation between the two is indisputable, there remains but the question whether the author of *Vsp.* has used *Bdr.* or both go back directly or indirectly to a common source. Inasmuch as both show a nearly identical strophe, such common source can have been no other than a poetical one, i. e. at most an earlier version of the *Bdr.* or a very similar poem.³³ That the latter may have been the case I am not prepared to deny; on the contrary, I would only insist that such earlier version of the *Bdr.* can not have differed greatly from the one preserved, either in form or content. To the author of *Vsp.*, *Bdr.* suggested a framework for his primarily eschatological poem, the allusion to *ragnarök* made by the *völva* in the last strophe being developed by him into a detailed account of that event and put into the mouth of the same *völva*.³⁴ This, as I am aware, does not at all correspond with Müllenhoff's theory of a three-fold structure of *Vsp.*,³⁵ but in spite of Müllenhoff's thunders one must accredit Bang³⁶ with a much less forced and artificial theory of the poem's composition, whether or not one agree with him entirely as to its sources.

A. LEROY ANDREWS.

Cornell University.

TEXTUAL NOTES ON THE ME. GENESIS AND EXODUS.

52 *ðat weldet alle ðinge vit rígt and [s] kíl.*

The metre requires *welt*, the form found in 54, two lines below.

369-370 *And niðful neddre, loð an liðer,
sal gliden on hise brest neðer.*

sary connection with the facts of the Baldr-myth preceding; in fact in the *Hauksbók*-version of *Vsp.*, from which the Baldr-strophes are lacking, this strophe appears, but in an entirely different place, viz., after str. 24.

³³ Cf. Niedner, l. c., pp. 37 f., 309.

³⁴ With reference to the framework of *Vsp.*, see also Grundtvig, *Bemærkninger til Vølvespaadommen*, særskilt aftryk af *Dansk Maanedsskrift*, 1866, andet Bind., p. 5 ff.

³⁵ *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, v, 5 ff.

³⁶ *Völuspá og de Sibyllinske Orakler*, = Christiania Videnskabselskabs Forhandling, 1879, No. 9, p. 6 f.

The second line of the couplet would be greatly improved if we should read, *on his brest sal gliden neðer*. But emendations of this kind, of which a number have already been made by Kölbing, Holthausen, and others, are not entirely convincing. It always remains possible that the author was occasionally guilty of writing unmetrical lines.

519-521 *Also he god adde ofte bi-sogte,
Wislike was him in herte brogt
ðis midelerdes biginning.*

For *bi-sogte*, read *bisogt*.

659-661 *Nembrot gat his feres red
To maken a tur.*

Morris translates *gat* by 'granted.' Instead, read *gaf*, as in 1949, 4047, 4064. Cf. Comestor, *Gen.* 38, *Consilio Nemrod volentis regnare, caeperunt aedificare turrim.*

1207-1208 *Ðre ger woren ysaae on
Quane he was fro teding don.*

Morris in his notes explains *teding* as for *tending*. Holthausen, *Archiv*, CVII, 389, in support of this cites Comestor, *Gen.* 56, *ablactatus est*. The word should be *tetting* (= 'lactatio'). The verb *tetten* occurs 2612 (Kölbing's emendation for *MS. letten*). The noun *tette* occurs 2621, and *teten*, 3480.

1323-1324 *Oc abraham it wulde wel
quat-so god bad, ðwerted he it neuer
[a del.]*

The second line of the couplet probably owes its length to the incorporation of a gloss. It originally read, *ðwerted he it neuer a del*. The antecedent of *it* in 1323, 1324, and in 1322 is the command of God of which Abraham tells in his previous speech. The words *quat-so god bad* were probably added by some reader to whom the *it* of 1323 seemed obscure. Cf. the footnote to p. 17 of Morris's edition for a similar gloss. A semicolon is needed after 1323.

1431-1432 *Or he wel homward cumen was,
Ysaac was cume to gerasis.*

Kölbing, *Eng. Stud.* III, 293, proposes to read *gerasas* or *geraras*. Comestor, *Gen.* 61, has, *Eo*

tempore Isaac habitabat in gerara. Gen. and Ex. has geraris, 1167, and gerasis, 1516. Comestor has geraris, Gen. 69 and elsewhere. Read geraris in 1432 and 1516, and cumen is in 1431. The clash of tenses is similar to that in numerous other passages; e. g., 1735-1736:

*Do sag iacob laban wurð wroð,
Vnder him ben leng is him loð.*

Cf. also 601-604, 885-886, 2543-2546, 4001-4002.

1585 *And ðu salt ðe betre sped.*

Supply *hauen* after *salt*.

1653-1654 *Rachel was bliðe and forð ghe nam,
And kiddit to hire fader laban.*

For *nam*, read *ran*, as in 1393-1394:

*Maiden rebecca ðanne ran,
And kiddit to hire broðer laban.*

1808 *Til ðe daning up esten it brast.*

For *daning*, read *daining*; cf. 77, *daigening*; 1810, *daining*; 3264, *daiening*.

1993-1994 *So michel fe ðor is hem told,
He hauen him bogt, he hauen sold.*

Holthausen, *Arch. für neu. Spr.* CVII, 391, proposes to supply *him* before *sold*. Kölbing, *Engl. Stud.* III, 303, comments as follows, "So wie sie (sc. die Ismaeliter) ihn gekauft hatten, so haben sie ihn nun wieder verkauft, oder—und dieser deutung würde ich den vorzug geben; sie (sc. Potiphar) haben ihn gekauft, jene (sc. die Ism.) haben ihn verkauft, d. h. es wurde soviel geld geboten, das der handel zum abschluss kam." This second interpretation can hardly be other than correct, but *he*, meaning Potiphar, requires a singular. For the first *hauen*, read *haueð*.

2010 *bitagte him his hus everile del.*

A transposition, *his hus bitagte him* would mend the metre.

2459-2460 *for trewðe and gode dedes mide
ðon ben al ðat wech-dede.*

Mätzner, *Altengl. Sprachproben*, I. 88, reads *ðor* for *ðon*, and translates, 'For both truth and good deeds there are then all that watch-deed.' Morris reads *don* for *ðon*, and translates, 'For truth and with good deeds, done is then all that

watch-deed.' Read *don bet*: 'For truth and good deeds therewith avail more than all that vigil.'

2521-2522 *An her endede, to ful in wis,
ðe boc ðe is hoten genesis.*

Mätzner, *Altenglische Sprachproben*, I, 89, corrects in *wis* to *i-wis*. For *endede* read *endeð* (= *Explicit liber Genesis*). Compare 2538, *Her nu bi-ginned exodus*. The confusion of *d* and *ð* is common in the MS. Apparently the copyist had before him *ended*.

2753 *And ben sone hom numen.*

Read *homward*, for metrical reasons, as in 1431, 2376.

2755 *And gunen him ðore tellen.*

Read *And him gunen*, for metrical reasons.

2804-2805 *And [he] it warp vt of hise hond,
And wurð sone an uglike snake.*

He was supplied by Kölbing, *Engl. Stud.* III, 313. For *wurð*, read *it wurð*; cf. 2808, *it bi-cam*, and 2917, *it wurð*.

2839-2840 *Moyse and his wif sephoram
And hise childre wið him nam.*

Omit *and* in 2839.

3509-3510 *Oe horedom ðat ðu ne do,
ne wend no lecherie to.*

After *horedom* insert *loke*; compare 3511, *Loke ðe wel ðat ðu ne stele*. It is true that 3513, *False witnesse ðat ðu ne bere*, seems to justify the MS. reading of 3509, but *ðat ðu ne bere* is really dependent upon *Loke ðe wel* of 3511.

3534 *And two oðere to maken it wel.*

Transpose so as to read *oðere two*. Compare 2132, *ðis oðere vii.*, and 686, *oðer sum*. The change seems to be required by metre and euphony.

3963-3964 *And he wurð ðo for anger wroð,
And ðis prikeð and negt sloð.*

He is Balaam. The word *asse* has been omitted after *ðis*; compare 3955, 3961, 3965, 3967, 3971, 3973, in each of which the author writes *ðis asse*.

3978 *ðe let god him ðat angel sen.*

God is Morris's correction for MS. *goð*. For *ðe* read *ðo*, as in 1416, which Morris has emended in his glossary.

4009-4010 *His lif beð bliðe, his ending sal,
ðe timeð al-so ðis timen sal.*

Inasmuch as 4010 corresponds to Comestor, Num. 33, *Moriatur anima mea morte justorum, et fiant mea horum similia*, it is probable that ðe timeð is an error of the copyist for me time.

4027-4028 *ðis leun sal oðer folc freten,
Lond canaan al preige bi-geten.*

For al, read als.

4112 *ðat al ðin folc wurð war.*

Some emendation is required for metrical reasons. Supply ðor-of after folc.

W. STRUNK, JR.

Cornell University.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

RAMÓN MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, *L'Épopée castillane à travers la littérature espagnole*. Traduction de HENRI MÉRIMÉE, avec une préface de ERNEST MÉRIMÉE. Paris, Colin, 1910. 12mo., xxvi + 306 pp.

R. Menéndez Pidal has probably shed more new light on the Old Spanish epic than any other living man, and students of that subject have learned to approach each new publication of his with the certainty of finding new facts and novel points of view. They will not be disappointed in the present volume, although not properly a work of research. It consists of the lectures delivered in French by the author at Johns Hopkins University in the spring of 1909, and now made accessible to the public in a revised form. The titles of the seven lectures (*Les origines de l'épopée castillane, Castille et Léon, Le "Poème de mon Cid," Le Cid et Chimène, Le "romancero," Le théâtre classique, La matière épique dans la poésie moderne*) indicate sufficiently that the speaker had no intention of offering his hearers a complete analysis of the Old Spanish epic; his desire was to generalize as much as possible and to make clear the forces which formed the epic spirit, and the power which it exerted on the literature of later times. In this

he has been eminently successful, without giving a detailed account of any of the poetic themes except those of Fernán González and the Cid.

The first chapter is the one calculated to excite the most interest among scholars, and will certainly provoke discussion, for it contains a new theory of the origin of the early Castilian epic poems. It has long been the fashion, supported chiefly by the writings of Gaston Paris, to declare the Spanish medieval epics children of the French, which were certainly more numerous and more fully developed. A few passages in the *Poema del Cid*, showing knowledge of French methods; a number of Carolingian romances, obviously based on the later poems dealing with the twelve peers; the stories of Bernardo del Carpio and Mainet, owing their inception to French legends;—this was the basis for the argument. The attempt has even been made (not with success in the reviewer's opinion) to show that the meter of the *Poema* was an adaptation of, or approximation to, the French alexandrine. It was assumed that epics did not appear in Spain till after the French heroic poetry had attained full growth.

But the increased knowledge within a few years of the unexpected extent and variety of the Castilian poems (knowledge due, in large measure, to R. Menéndez Pidal himself) has caused the French theory to look less imposing. And now the young professor of Madrid declares boldly that the Gallic element in the Castilian epics on native subjects is negligible, and that the true source is to be sought in Germanic traditions, in the legends and poetry brought with them by the Visigoths when they entered Spain.

His argument may be summarized thus: There is no evidence that French civilization or literature penetrated Spain before about 1100. The events which gave rise to the epics on Fernán González and the Infantes de Lara occurred in the tenth century; the first poems were probably composed soon after the deeds. There is slight French influence in the *Poema del Cid* and later poems; but in general the whole conception and method of treatment differ in France and Castile. The existence of songs of epic nature among the early Germanic tribes is attested by Tacitus; other witnesses can be adduced for the same phenomenon among the Visigoths in the fourth century, but

unfortunately not after their conquest of Spain. There is, however, every reason to suppose that they still celebrated their national heroes in verse. One of them was Walter of Spain, or Walter of Aquitania, who lived at the time of Attila and was famous all over Europe. His legend was put into Latin hexameters by the monk Ekkehard (tenth century). His story is also preserved in the Spanish romance of Gaiferos (Wolf, *Primavera y Flor de romances*, no. 173); many details are strikingly similar. (We cannot repress a smile at seeing our old acquaintance Gaiferos, he who was manipulated by the agile fingers of Ginés de Pasamonte for the benefit of Don Quijote (II, 26), converted into the stout hero whose adventures we remember reading, long ago, in Scheffel's *Ekkehard*). The customs described in the Castilian epics are Germanic. Although Spain adopted some themes from the north (Bernardo, Mainet), French influence upon the epics of native subject, even on the *Poema del Cid*, which was composed at the time when French civilization was in most close contact with that of Spain, is of the slightest and purely external. The rigorously historical and realistic nature of the Castilian epic contrasts sharply with the exaggerations and enchantments of the French.

The Castilians were the only people of the Peninsula to inherit the heroic poetry of the Visigoths. This in spite of the fact that the Leonese maintained the governmental machinery of the last Visigothic rulers, whilst the Castilians rebelled against it. Castile rested upon a Celtiberian foundation, and León, Aragon and Catalonia were based on Iberian stock.

Such is the substance of Menéndez Pidal's theory, which is of far-reaching importance and cannot fail to act as a sharp stimulus to Hispanic studies. It is the inevitable result of the recent discoveries in the field of Spanish medieval poetry. So long as two poems about the Cid were the only Castilian epics known to exist in verse form, so long as the historical romances were thought to be relics of primitive songs woven into lengthy poems only under French influence, and the Carolingian romances, so numerous and long, were known to be taken from French sources, it was easy to say that what few Spanish epics existed were mere offshoots of the luxuriant growth across the Pyre-

nees. But the work of Milá and his pupils, which need not be recapitulated here, has made that position no longer impregnable. The Spaniards were certain to attack it. It is beyond doubt that the Carolingian romances are of late origin; that long before them there were Castilian epics exhibiting strong poetic qualities and based on purely national events. Whence did they come? Is it not more natural to assume that the spirit of heroic poetry among the Visigoths persisted unbroken than to suppose conscious imitation of French poems, themselves admittedly of Germanic origin? Would it not be strange that these imitations of a poetry quite different in character should pitch upon subjects, like that of the Infantes de Lara, of private nature, based on events one or two hundred years old?

On the other hand, it is inevitable that in a first presentation of such a new and remote matter there should be parts not altogether clear and complete. The novelty of Menéndez Pidal's theory, as well as the broad character of the lectures, entail a certain lack of absolute proof. It will some time be necessary, for example, to make a fuller comparative study of the French and Spanish epics from the new viewpoint, and in the light of the recent labors of Bédier, for it is obvious that the literary origins of the two nations cannot be kept entirely separate. And one might point to weak links in the chain of facts adduced which need to be strengthened by additional evidence. The fact that the copenetration of French and Spanish civilizations was greatest about 1100 does not prove that there was none previous to that time; and it is not likely that the Oxford version of the *Chanson de Roland* was the first French epic, when the battle which gave rise to it occurred in 778. One can perhaps grant without too much credulity that the Visigoths continued to sing of their heroes after they entered Spain, even if there is not the slightest proof of it, and the conquerors were few in number compared with the earlier Romanized inhabitants of the Peninsula. It may not be possible to maintain that the population of Castile was Celtiberian when that of León was Iberian, for these pre-Roman distinctions, dubious in themselves, must have been altered by the successive waves of invasion that swept the land; it is not easy to see what

connection that has with the preservation of Visigothic poetical tradition in Castile alone, if that be a fact.

Nor are we prepared to concede all the force which Menéndez Pidal seems to give to the analogies between the *Gaiferos romance* and the legend of Walter of Aquitania. The resemblances are striking, as Milá pointed out in 1874, and it may be that Gaiferos and Melisenda are really Walfarius and Hiltgunde, their names modified by contamination with other heroes and heroines (Walfarius and Belissent). But the story might have been borrowed from foreign or erudite sources as well as from native tradition more than a thousand years old; and the facts in hand hardly bear out the assertion that "nous devons considérer le romance de Gaifer comme un fragment, conservé par le hasard, du lien mystérieux qui unit l'épopée visigothe à la poésie héroïque castillane." It may be that the lecturer will develop this point more fully at some future time, and at least we may hope that his extreme diligence and scholarship will produce the new documentation required to prove a theory attractive in itself.

In the other chapters devoted to the Middle Ages Menéndez Pidal goes fully into the epic material concerning Fernán González and the Cid, and mentions only by the way King Roderick, Bernardo del Carpio and the Infantes de Lara. Chapter II describes the traditional hostility between Castile and León. The author believes, as was noted above, that the source of it was a basic difference of racial structure: Castile, the Celtiberian, being progressive and rebellious; León, Iberian (as were also Aragon and Catalonia), being conservative, fond of tradition and wedded to the Visigothic system of government. It is heartily to be wished that the ideas here expressed in all too concise form may some time be expanded; for it is a difficult problem to determine what elements composed the population of the various provinces of Spain as they were wrested from the Moors. The author states that Castile alone inherited the Visigothic heroic poetry, just as certain regions of France, in which the Germanic element was strongest, alone produced the Old French epic.

The Castilian erudite *Poema de Fernán González* is summarized as an example of the hatred

of León, preserved in an attenuated form, but with traces of the popular epic which surely existed. Even after the union of Castile and León on equal terms in the person of Fernando I, the enmity and wars continued, and received poetic expression in the lost *cantares* of the death of king Fernando (also called *La Partición de los reinos*), and of *El Cerco de Zamora*. The author gives abstracts, based on the prose versions of the *Primera crónica general* and the *Segunda crónica general (de 1344)* of these two highly poetic epics, which have left traces in some of the finest fragments of the *romancero*.¹ The epic of Fernán González was partisan, strongly favoring Castile; that of the Siege of Zamora, more lofty and artistic, presents an impartiality which foreshadows the truly national epic, the *Cantar de Mio Cid*.

The Cid is the hero of chapters III and IV, and national pride inspires in the lecturer eloquent and illuminating paragraphs. He tells the story of the *Mio Cid*, and makes a striking comparison between its author and Velázquez; both exemplify the best side of the Spanish national genius, a tranquil realism, without effort or exaggeration, that remains faithful to history in spirit, however it may idealize details. The later epic describing the Youth of Rodrigo is, however, a degenerate invention, full of gross fictions. Menéndez Pidal distinguishes two versions of the *Rodrigo*: the first, preserved in the prose of the *Crónica de 1344*; the second, the well-known *Crónica rimada*, which he places at about 1400. Various details prove at least that it is later than 1344. In the *prosified* story the Cid is still respectful toward his monarch, but in the *Crónica rimada* he becomes a turbulent rebel, overawing his king by sheer bravado, as did the heroes of the late French *chansons de geste*. This is the type adopted by the *romancero*.

¹ Menéndez Pidal gives the reasons, based largely upon the as yet inaccessible *Segunda crónica general*, for supposing that the *Cantar del rey don Fernando* or *de la partición de los reinos* was distinct from the *Cantar del cerco de Zamora*. Milá (*Obras completas*, VII, 262) and Menéndez y Pelayo (*Tratado de los romances viejos*, I, 335) had already promulgated the same theory. Each new study of the Old Spanish epic makes it clearer that an edition of the *Crónica de 1344* entire is an absolute necessity if we are to be able to study at first hand the *prosifications* of the lost poems.

The gradual evolution of the Cid's love-story is laid minutely before the reader, from the bare fact of history and the conjugal affection of the *Mío Cid*, through the rude courtship described in the *Rodrigo* and the romantic incidents added by the *romancero*, to the love-drama of conflicting passions imagined by Guillén de Castro and given wide currency by Corneille. In tracing this history Menéndez Pidal brings out once more the fact which it has been his special mission to establish, namely, that it is now possible to follow the whole development of the Castilian epic from the twelfth century to the *romances*, without solution of continuity.

Chapter V, although compact, is a most luminous account of the formation and development of the Spanish ballad. The earliest group of *romances* was formed by the disintegration of the old historical epics; the most striking episodes were remembered and repeated by the people, and changed greatly in the course of time. The second group came from the application of a similar process to poems of *juglares* who celebrated French heroes, but gave them deeds of Spanish invention. Then there came the attractive cycle of *romances* dealing with contemporary history; Pedro el Cruel, and the unceasing struggles of Moors and Christians. They show a prolongation of the primitive epic spirit which is not found so late in any other continental nation. It seems to have lost its creative force at about the time of the conquest of Granada, but the popularity of the *romances viejos* increased steadily throughout the sixteenth century. Fame was followed by imitation. The erudite poetasters Fuentes and Sepúlveda (1550-1) attempted to supplant fiction by what they deemed fact, in verse, with lamentable results. Toward 1600 the greatest poets of the *siglo de oro* wrote *romances* on every conceivable subject, by no means confining themselves to historical themes. Their poems about the Cid are better known to the educated classes to-day than are the old ballads on the same subject. Meanwhile the *romances viejos* lived in the memory of the lower classes, and were carried by emigration to other parts of the world, so that modern traditional versions are found all over Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking territory, —in Morocco, Turkey, South America, Madeira,

the Azores, etc. This is a field which has been much studied by Menéndez Pidal of late years, and he has promised a *Romancero general* which shall include the best of the poems gleaned by modern collectors from the lips of peasants.

The sixth chapter deals with the national epic as it influenced the drama of the *siglo de oro*. Menéndez Pidal implies, though he does not make the statement in so many words, that the popularity of the old ballads in the sixteenth century may have saved Spain from the fate of France, and rescued the Spanish stage from servile subjection to pseudo-classic rules. The subjects of Spanish plays in the first half of the sixteenth century were taken from Italian comedies and *novelle*, or pastorals, romances of chivalry and the *Celestina*. In 1579 Juan de la Cueva produced a play, *La Muerte del rey don Sancho*, based on the legends of the Siege of Zamora, and quoted lines from a popular *romance* (Wolf, *Primavera*, no. 45). Cueva opened the way to more talented authors who exploited the national history, both real and legendary, upon the stage. *Romances*, and especially the *Chronicles*, those repositories of lost epics, were plundered to enrich the drama. Lope de Vega, with seventy plays, was the most brilliant and fertile in this field; but he was rivalled by Guillén de Castro, Luis Vélez de Guevara, and other lesser lights. This is a question which has already been discussed at some length by Menéndez y Pelayo in the *Antología de poetas líricos*, vol. ix, pp. 259-279, and in the introductions to the Academy edition of Lope de Vega; but Menéndez Pidal has succeeded in finding additional material. The second generation of dramatists, led by Calderón, cast aside the *romances* as such, and preserved the heroic fictions only in a modernized, emasculated form.

In tracing the further course of the epic matter, (chapter VII) the eighteenth century, divided between decadent Gongorism and ill-digested pseudo-classicism, could furnish little material. One might have expected, perhaps, a mention of the *romances* of the elder Moratín, some of which show a curious knowledge and use of the old ballads. But the advent of romanticism presaged renewed interest in the Middle Ages. In Spain the movement was initiated from without. Englishmen and Germans discovered before Spaniards

the beauties of some of the old Castilian legends; Hookham Frere guided the muse of the Duque de Rivas to *El moro expósito*, and Walter Scott inspired Zorrilla. Menéndez Pidal devotes the major part of his last chapter to the latter. He presents a picture both critical and sympathetic of the little genius, lovable and conceited, whose vivid imagination played at will upon medieval history and legend, believing or discarding, and in case of need inventing. In *El zapatero y el rey*, *Sancho García*, *El puñal del godo*, Zorrilla created tradition with great freedom. In *Granada* (1852) he employed a more severe historical method, and this unfinished epic, inspired by the best frontier ballads, was his last masterpiece. The *Leyenda del Cid*, written thirty years later, is a verbose paraphrase of all the Cid ballads, without discrimination.

Blasco Ibáñez, the foremost Spanish novelist who is active at the present day, paid tribute to a medieval epic in *El conde Garci Fernández* (1888). Younger literary men, stimulated perhaps by the recent publications of Menéndez y Pelayo and Menéndez Pidal himself, have shown increasing signs of turning to the most genuine old sources; witness Marquina's *Las hijas del Cid* (1908), a play based upon a study of the *Mío Cid* itself.

Thus, says Menéndez Pidal in conclusion, the national epic tradition, more continuous in Spain than in any other country, extends down to the very present. Far from having exhausted its power, it is able to direct both literature and life in the future, if by profound inquiry into the *archeological psychology* of the Middle Ages Spaniards will discover the secrets of that energetic race from which they are descended.

Those who know Menéndez Pidal only by his works of pure erudition, those for example who have never read his address upon reception into the Spanish Academy, will be delighted at the power of generalization and depth of literary insight displayed in this volume. It is the true test of learning to be able to grasp a vast number of scattered facts, order them wisely and lay bare the forces that gave them birth.

One should not leave unnoticed the preface by Ernest Mérimée, part of which is devoted to the previous publications of R. Menéndez Pidal.

Many of his writings have been scattered in out of the way corners, in the *Homenaje á Menéndez y Pelayo* (1899), in another *Homenaje* to Almeida-Garrett (Genoa, 1900), in still another to the Arabist Codera y Zaidín (1904), and elsewhere; and it is a relief to have an authoritative list placed before one. Finally, the book contains a very complete analytical table of contents, and an index of proper names and titles in both French and Spanish. These useful compilations remove the work from the category of a collection of detached studies, and give it the value of a reference-book.

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY.

University of Colorado.

Grillparzers Werke. Im Auftrage der Reichshaupt- und Residenzstadt Wien herausgegeben von AUGUST SAUER. Erster Band. Die Ahnfrau. Sappho.—Wien und Leipzig: Gerlach und Wiedling, 1909.

Der lang ersehnte erste Band der neuen, kritischen Grillparzer-Ausgabe ist endlich erschienen und gereicht dem Herausgeber wie der Auftraggeberin zur höchsten Ehre. Was der Eingeweihte nicht anders erwartete, ist zur Tat geworden: ein mustergültiges Werk. Wir haben die Garantie, dass für Grillparzer jetzt dasselbe geleistet wird, wie für Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, Herder und neuerdings Wieland. Der deutsche Klassiker aus Österreich kommt zu seinem Recht. Endlich wird der Welt sein gesamtes Schaffen erschlossen, dessen volles Verständnis ermöglicht. Jetzt erst beginnt die "Wissenschaft" von Grillparzer,—die hoffentlich die Freude an dem Dichter nicht in Kleinphilologie begräbt.

Sauer hat in seiner umsichtigen Weise den Stoff zweckmässig in zwei getrennte Abteilungen gegliedert, mit folgender Anordnung im Einzelnen: I) die Werke der reifen Zeit; die Dramen, dramatischen Fragmente, Satiren und Übersetzungen; die Gedichte und Epigramme; die Erzählungen, Prosa-Satiren und Prosa-Aufsätze; die zusammenhängenden Studien und schliesslich die übrige Masse von zerstreuten Prosa-Aufzeichnungen. II) die Jugendwerke; die Tagebücher

und ähnliches; Briefe und amtliche Dokumente. Innerhalb der Gruppen findet chronologische Ordnung statt.

Dementsprechend enthält der vorliegende Band *Die Ahnfrau* (letzte und erste Fassung) und *Sappho*. Vorausgeschickt ist eine allgemeine Einführung mit einer meisterhaften, hinreissend temperamentvoll geschriebenen Charakteristik Grillparzers. Daran reihen sich besondere Einleitungen zu den beiden Dramen. Den Schluss des Bandes bildet ein äusserst wertvoller Apparat von Anmerkungen.

Die Einleitungen behandeln die Entstehungsgeschichte und Quellenfrage von *Ahnfrau* und *Sappho* mit jener Klarheit, Gründlichkeit und knappen Vollständigkeit, die wir bei Sauer gewohnt sind, die aber immer wieder Bewunderung hervorruft. Alle bisherigen Forschungen sind herangezogen und überholt. Wo noch Untersuchungen einzusetzen hätten, werden die nötigen Fingerzeige gegeben. Als Beispiel mag bei Gelegenheit der *Ahnfrau* der Hinweis auf E. T. A. Hoffmann dienen: *Elixire des Teufels* < *Ambrosio*, or *The Monk* von M. G. Lewis; die deutsche Bearbeitung dieses Schauerromans (*Die blutende Gestalt*, etc.), dessen Abhängigkeit wieder von deutschen Quellen (Musäus u. a.).

Bei *Sappho* überrascht der Nachweis von Wielands bestimmender Einwirkung. Man beruhigte sich gerne bei Grillparzers Geständnis, er habe hier mit Goethes Kalb gepflegt. Nun wird es plötzlich klar, dass vor allen andern Wieland es war, der Problem, Motive und Farben lieferte: *Agathon*, *Aristipp*, dann *Menander* und *Glycerion* usw. Auch Madame de Staëls *Corinna* erscheint jetzt definitiv als eine der Hauptquellen. Das Verhältnis Corinna-Oswald-Lucile entspricht genau dem Verhältnis Sappho-Phaon-Melitta. Dazu kommt noch Goethe, Schiller, Zacharias Werner und—Kotzebue. Bei so mannigfacher, so starker Beeinflussung scheint es immer undenkbarer, dass das Werk zu einem innerlich geschlossenen werden konnte. Der Dichter selbst hatte bekanntlich das Gefühl, dass sich ein zweiter Plan in den ursprünglichen hineingeschoben habe. Trotzdem glaubt Sauer mit Emil Reich u. a. an die absolute Einheitlichkeit. Grillparzer soll zu pessimistisch gewesen sein. Hier kann ich nicht folgen. Der Ausspruch des Künstlers über sein Werk beruht

doch wohl auf einem unbeirrbaren Instinkt. Vielleicht klappt der grosse Riss—es gibt noch viele kleine—nicht genau an der von Gr. bezeichneten Stelle. Mathematisch ausrechnen lässt sich so etwas nicht. Aber Sauer stimmt mit Gr. darin überein, dass anfangs nur das Weib, erst gegen Schluss die Künstlerin Sappho erscheine. Genügt das nicht, jene andere Aussage Grillparzers zu stützen? Das dramatisch-tragische Problem soll sein: Kunst und Leben. Die Ver- und Entwicklung rein menschlicher Beziehungen erleben wir vier Akte lang; und der fünfte lässt nicht sowohl das Weib, das die Kraft der Entsagung besitzt, als die Künstlerin, die sich entweiht glaubt, scheitern, eine Sappho, die in den ersten Akten zwar dem Namen, aber nicht dem Wesen nach, existierte. Ist der Fall nicht dem *Don Karlos* ähnlich? Nun ist dieser langsam und ruckweise entstanden, die *Sappho* in kurzen Wochen niedergeschrieben worden. Das beweist nichts gegen die Möglichkeit von Spaltungen. So übergelassen von literarischen Anregungen, und eingeständenermassen noch nicht im sicheren Besitz eines eigenen Stils, konnte der Dichter auch innerhalb einer geringen Spanne Zeit von den verschiedensten Stimmungsimpulsen getrieben werden. Ja musste es, da er nicht so über seinen Stoff Herr war, wie Goethe, als er an seinen *Tasso* die letzte Hand legte. Soweit eigene Lebenserfahrung in *Sappho* enthalten ist, hat Gr. den Ausdruck dafür nicht aus eigenen Mitteln bestritten, sondern von Vorbildern erborgt. Es ist im wesentlichen ein Literaten-, kein Lebenswerk. Eine sehr zu wünschende Stiluntersuchung würde zeigen, wie wenig es Grillparzer gelungen ist, in seinem Gedächtnis die vielen einzelnen Reminiscenzen und deren jeweiligen Rhythmus unlösbar mit einander zu verschmelzen. Freilich, über der Darstellung bezaubernder Künstlerinnen vergisst sich das. Die österreichische Kritik steht unter dem Bann solcher Personalunionen, die aber keine organische Einheit des Werkes selbst bedeuten.

O. E. LESSING.

University of Illinois.

Hálfs Saga ok Hálfsrekka. Herausgegeben von A. LEROY ANDREWS. Altnordische Sagabibliothek, No. 14. Halle, 1909.

Notwithstanding its somewhat meagre and fragmentary nature, the *Hálfs saga* is an attractive one, by reason of the great diversity of material it offers within a small compass. The main story itself is the stereotype Fornaldarsaga; but interwoven, more or less loosely, are a number of interesting mythical and mythic-historic episodes, such as the promise of the Unborn Child; an offshoot of the Polyphemos story; the prophetic watersprite; the motive of the Unfaithful Wife; of the Supposititious Child; and others. Besides, an unusual amount of poetical matter, three longer poems and a number of lausavísur, serve to diversify the contents.

The saga has been fortunate in its editors. Following the *editio princeps* of Rafn, in the *Fornaldarsögur Norðurlanda* (1829), Bugge furnished a reliable critical text, with some brilliant emendations, in the first fascicle of his "Norrøne Skrifter af Sagnhistorisk Indhold" (1864). Partial editions were brought out by Ettmüller (Lüning), Vigfússon and Powell, and, recently (1903), by Heusler and Ranisch in their *Eddica Minora*.

The aim of the present editor is to make the saga more generally accessible (by furnishing a detailed commentary and notes, conformable to the purpose of the series), and by a comprehensive study of the entire material¹ to trace the development and later history of the Hálfr story. Of both tasks he has acquitted himself admirably.

For reasons with which we are bound to agree, Andrews holds that originally there existed a prose *Hálfs saga* with interspersed lausavísur; that it became rather a favorite, furnishing poets the subjects for the Insteinn, Útsteinn, and Hrókr songs; and that the compiler of the saga as we have it uncritically incorporated into the text all later embellishments, even when overlapping or conflicting. For one thing, the songs are conclusively shown not to be the source of the prose,² excepting, perhaps, certain portions of the Inn-

steinskvæði. At the same time, certain divergences between the prose and the songs seem to point to differing original versions and to the likelihood of an oral existence of the saga.

There is considerable difficulty in fixing the date of composition. Assuming borrowing into the Landnámabók, the saga was composed not later than the middle of the thirteenth century. On the other hand, the Heimskringla (ca. 1220-1230) may have been drawn upon. But this evidence is not any too strong. Andrews does not choose to make use of the argument offered in the ages of 12 and 13, respectively, being given explicitly, both in the prose and the Hrókskvæði, for Hálfr and Hjörólfr, when starting out on their Viking careers. But if Mogk and Finnur Jónsson are right in accepting the testimony of Helgakviða Hundingsbana I v. 10, as furnishing corroborative evidence that this poem was not composed before the eleventh century (when the coming of age had been postponed, both in Norway and Iceland, to the fifteenth year),³ we are justified in thinking, conversely, of the original version of our saga as existing a considerable time before its being committed to writing. Unless, indeed, we assume that both poet and sagawriter knew and consciously employed a knowledge of this fact in order to produce the semblance of antiquity. This doubt must not be suppressed, seeing that the Hrókskvæði shows Romantic influence and in v. 63 a knowledge, perhaps, of the youngest of the Eddic poems.⁴

In connection with the argument above preferred I would urge that the older version of the saga seems, after all, more Norwegian than Icelandic. The mention of a hnotskóg,⁵ of an oak,⁶ of hunting on the Hardangervidda, and the accurate and intimate knowledge shown of S. W. Norway and its local points of interest and lore, especially as compared with the vagueness of geo-

³ K. Maurer, *ZfdPhil.*, II, 443.

⁴ *Gripisspá*, v. 43, l. 4.

⁵ Cf. the lovely hazelnut-groves of the Hardanger. A. fails to point out the significance of Hrókr's wooing in the nut-shaw, a locality supposed to be especially favorable to secret love. Cf. *Folklore Record*, I, 155. Cf. also *Egils saga ok Ásmundar* (Fas. III, 365), where the same phrase alluded to occurs, and a maiden of the same name (Brynhildr) is abducted.

⁶ Though *eik* may also mean simply 'tree.'

¹ In the introduction of 68 pages which is also obtainable separately as a Kiel dissertation, 1908.

² As Mogk thought, *Gdr.*, II, p. 832.

graphical information on other parts—all this seems to argue that the kernel of the story at least is Norwegian.

The second part of the introduction concerns itself with the provenience of the later evidences of the *Hálfstory* in Swedish, Danish, and Faroese ballads.

In the following a few notes on some minor points where I disagree with the editor.

Geirhildr Drífsdóttir (chap. 1). To be sure, a man's name Drífr occurs nowhere else⁷; but in 'Hversu Noregr byggðiz'⁸ we are told that Þór Snæs konungs voru þau Þorri (his son) ok Fönn, Drífa ok Mjöll (his daughters). Since Óðinn himself condescends to woo Geirhild⁹ it lies near to assume Drífr to be simply a transference of the naive personification contained in the name of Drífa (= 'snow-squall'), made with the manifest kind intention to assign the maiden to an ancient and respectable, yet not too well-known, family.¹⁰ Significantly, it is not said *where* Geirhildr Drífsdóttir hails from—we presume, from Jötunheim, whither Óðinn resorted not infrequently on amorous adventure bound.

V. 10. *Dregir mik engi / i degi síðan // maðr upp i skib / af mararbotnum*—does not, of course, mean 'niemand soll mich wieder bei tage heraufziehen'; but rather, 'no one shall (*N. B.* rather 'will')¹¹ ever, etc.' See Egilsson¹² sub *dagr*; also Fritzner sub *dagr* 2. Andrews no doubt had in mind the German 'zu tage fördern'; but this usage is foreign to Icelandic.

That Andrews should base his text on Bugge's edition is a procedure entirely justifiable; but it would not have been amiss to print *all* the more important deviations from the ms., for the sake of control by those to whom Bugge's work is not

accessible. The advisability of this will come out in the following instance.

V. 43 (*Útsteinskvæði*):—*eigi var / órum bróður // við dritmenni þitt / dramb at setja*. *Þitt* was emended by Bugge to read *títt*, and simply omitted by Heusler-Ranisch (followed by A., but without any note whatsoever) as "metrisch überladend." A. translates: "nicht aber war es meines bruders art, sich in prahlerei mit scheisskerlen zu messen"; but there is no authority for rendering *setja* (*eht við enm*) by "sich messen mit." Rather, *setja* (with acc. of thing) has the meaning of "to put down, settle, allay."¹³

In the *Swipdagspátr* of the *Hrólfs saga Kraka* there is a situation unmistakably similar to the one in question. Now in the course of the challenges the utterance is made: "*ek skal setja þik ok semja dramb þitt*,"¹⁴ "I shall put you down and settle your arrogance."¹⁵ This clinches the meaning of *setja* in our passage.—Again, *setja* (with acc. of object) is almost invariably associated with the adverb *níðr*. This suggests a reading *dritmenni*: eth. dat. *níðr*/, omitting *við*, which may have crept in from *við ragmenni*, *við Ulfsonu*. a few lines above and below. For, notwithstanding Bugge's note,¹⁶ on the use of *við* in this passage, it is harsh, just because of the slightly different use in the two other cases. The use of the second person of the possessive pronoun in vocative, and especially vituperative, expressions of this nature was, possibly, all too familiar a phenomenon to the copyist of the vellum to be resisted. So he simply substituted *þitt* for *níðr*.

V. 25. The name *Vifill* occurs oftener than the note of Heusler and Ranisch¹⁷ (unquestioningly referred to by A.) indicates. Their query "wurde der name in Island zunächst als sklavenname verwendet, und haftete ihm etwas gering-schätziges an" ? is answered by the occurrence of *Vifill konungr* (in *Hversu Noregr byggðiz*)¹⁸

⁷ Cf. Bugge, *loc. cit.*, p. 3, note.

⁸ Fas. II, 3. The name occurs also in the *Ánssaga bogsveigis*, Fas., II, 340.

⁹ For her name cf. that of the Valkyrja Geirskögull.

¹⁰ Her earthly suitor, Alrekr, is fabled to be ultimately of the same race, Fas. II, 5.

¹¹ The marmennil had enough of one experience, and is resolved that no one is ever going to draw him out again.

¹² *Lex. Poet. Sept.* I note that M. Moe makes the same mistake in his (free) rendition of the verse, on p. 628 of *Finnerne i gamle historiske sagn* (in A. Helland's *Beskrielse over Finnmarkens Amt*, vol. II).

¹³ See Fritzner sub *setja* 7.

¹⁴ Fas. I, 38. This is all the more noteworthy since A. recognized another point of contact with this saga, Ed., p. 29.

¹⁵ Cf. also *Þiðrekssaga*, chap. 68: *Nú mælti margr maðr á þessa lund, at þar sem maðr setr dramb sit húst, at þat kann lægst at leggið.*

¹⁶ *L. c.*, p. 44.

¹⁷ *Flateyrbók*, I, 24.

¹⁸ *Edd. Min.*, xxxiv.

and of *Vifill jarl* (in the *Þorsteinssaga Víkingssonar*).¹⁹ We find the name already on the *Pilgärdstone* in Gothland, and in the collocation "*Vifil bauð um*."²⁰ And some noble *Vifell* occurs in the *Hestaheiti* (*Skáldskm.* ch. 58).

I cannot forbear, in conclusion, to mention Andress' highly interesting explanation²¹ of the hitherto obscure '*Svarðar dóttir*' as *S(ig)varðar dóttir*, which seems very plausible indeed. Together with the tentative assignation of vs. 8-10 to *Einarrr Helgason skalaglam*, it is one of the best things in the book.²²

L. M. HOLLANDER.

University of Wisconsin.

Common Difficulties in Reading French, by CHARLES C. CLARKE, JR. New York: William R. Jenkins Co. [1910].

Professor Clarke has made a successful attempt to collect in a small volume the words and phrases which trouble students most frequently, and by omitting all but difficult questions has been able to discuss these at length. At times his discussions are even longer than is necessary. Frequently statements occur which are superfluous, if they are warnings, and unsatisfactory, if they are explanations: "Do not confuse these words"—"Note the two words"—"... is a word often misunderstood"—"... does not mean just what it seems to"—etc.

On the other hand, omissions are numerous. P. 3, in discussing the uses of *accroire*, he omits the idiom *s'en faire accroire*, 'presume too much.'—P. 13 he neglects to mention that *avoir* frequently means 'to secure.'—P. 14 he should have warned us that it is only when *avoir beau* is followed by an infinitive that it means 'to do in vain.' *Vous l'avez beau* means 'you have a fine opportunity.'—P. 27, a long list of idiomatic phrases with *coup* fails to include the very common *coup d'état*.—P. 138: "Notice that it is very common for the conclusion of a conditional sentence to appear with merely an implied condition or a complete ellipsis of it." Is it not exactly as useful to know that the conditional part may sometimes appear without the conclusion?

As to his choice of words and phrases for discussion, there is little but praise to be said. A

¹⁹ Fas. II, 384. Cf. also *Vifills borg*, *Ragnarss. L.*, Fas. I, 273.

²⁰ Trans. by Bugge, *Norges Indskrifter med de yngre Runer*, p. 18: 'Dette Ombud (eller Opdrag) gav. V.'

²¹ Ed., p. 15f.

²² Cf. now also Neckel, *Beiträge zur Eddaforschung*, 1908, pp. 98f., on the interpretation of v. 21.

test of the book reveals only a small number of common mistakes that are not treated. He has forgotten to distinguish *matin* from *mâtin*; *mépris* from *méprise*; *pécher* from *pêcher*, but even such omissions are rare.

There are a number of errors. I omit the most of those that are purely typographical: P. 5, under *Affaire*. The running of two paragraphs into one leaves the reader in confusion till he discovers the error.—P. 31. "*De* is placed, in an expletive way, before certain classes of words, where in English there is no chance to render it at all." And as one illustration of this use: "*Votre polisson de frère* (your rascal of a brother)."—P. 38. "*Durant* is often equivalent to *Pendant*, 'while' or 'during' (see *Pendant*)." But *pendant* does not appear at all.—P. 77. "After *que* and *si*, *l'* usually appears before *on* to prevent a hiatus." But if *on* followed *que* there would be no hiatus in any case.—P. 91. "*Réclamer* had better not be translated 'reclaim,' but 'to find fault,' to 'protest.'" Is it not true, rather, that *réclamer* is sometimes 'reclaim,' and at other times 'find fault' or 'protest'?—P. 95. "*Savoir* is one of four verbs that can be rendered negative by *ne* alone." There are more than four such verbs.—P. 124. "*Selon lui cortège aurait suivi*," etc., apparently for "*Selon lui le cortège*," etc.—P. 124. The paragraph marked N. B. is evidently misplaced.

The useful part of the book is the alphabetical list of words and phrases which forms Part I. Part II, "Notes on Syntax," is in no wise different from the ordinary grammar, and Part III is a succinct reference table of irregular verbs.

R. T. HOUSE.

Weatherford, Okla.

Sheridan, From New and Original Material; Including a Manuscript Diary of Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire. By WALTER SICHEL. In two volumes. Illustrated. Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1909. 8vo., pp. xix + 631; xi + 549.

Heretofore two other men have dealt with Sheridan's life at first hand, Thomas Moore and Fraser Rae. Moore's *Life* has always been regarded as inadequate and unjust. Rae's *Biography*, in its statement of facts, is excellent; yet most readers, I believe, have felt repelled by the hero-worship which so highly colors its estimates of Sheridan's personality and achievements. Mr. Sichel justly censures Rae as follows: "Least of

all was he [Sheridan] the rose-water liberal and high-souled enthusiast of his last biographer, Mr. Rae, who has scrubbed him with Sunday soap till he shines like one of Wilkie's peasants." Certainly a juster estimate and a fuller life of Sheridan is welcome.

In his Preface Mr. Sichel states his two-fold purpose: (1) to portray Sheridan for the first time at "full-length," and (2) to present with this portrait an adequate background of the period. To accomplish these ends he has attempted to examine all the original manuscript authorities, and all books and pamphlets of any importance that bear on the subject. He has, it seems, left no stone unturned; and whatever may be the shortcomings of his book, one cannot charge him with a lack of industry. Indeed his labor, extended over years, seems to have been largely one of love. A glance at the numerous illustrations beneath which appear the significant words "in the possession of the author," shows how deeply absorbed he became in his task.

Sheridan achieved fame in two separate careers, first in literature, later in politics. Accordingly, Mr. Sichel has devoted Volume One to Sheridan's literary, and Volume Two to his political career. But before beginning the narrative he gives us what he terms an "Overture," dealing at great length (180 pages) with "The Man" and "The Moment." In this prefatory essay he attempts "to put the man and his environment into distinct categories . . . to psychologise a temperament and a time." The most interesting feature of his discussion of "The Man" is his effort to show that the secret springs of Sheridan's life were primarily sentimentalism and melancholia. "In the rough, then, Sheridan offers a study in sentiment. Round this he revolves, and it explains much in him that would otherwise remain a riddle. It is his central aspect, and all other clues to his nature radiate from it." Yet, accompanying this sentimentalism, as a kind of complement, was a strain of melancholia: "He was also what Heine has termed another, 'the knight of the laughing tear.' A constitutional melancholy neighbored his mirth, the irony of things underlay his gayest outbursts, and his mind, like that of his frolicsome forerunner, the comic Farquhar, was frequently 'dressed in black.'"

After this "Overture," given first that it may not "impede the narrative," Mr. Sichel proceeds to Sheridan's life. Working in the field almost immediately after Rae, and handling practically the same material, he has been able to check the statements of the former; hence his work has a certain authoritativeness that otherwise it would not have had. At the outset he takes issue with Rae as to the time of Sheridan's birth. This Rae had assigned, without warrant, it seems, to Octo-

ber 30; Mr. Sichel declares: "The precise day, and indeed month of Sheridan's birth is unascertained."¹ In many similar cases of detail he has been able to correct his predecessors, and frequently to settle matters hitherto in doubt. These are too numerous for mention here. Not the least interesting, however, are those in connection with Sheridan's duels. For example, it is shown that the famous letter purported to have been written by Miss Linley, and long discredited as a clumsy forgery, was in all probability a transcript from a genuine letter.

In addition to chronicling biographical facts, Mr. Sichel has quoted lavishly from Sheridan's various poems and essays, most of which he reproduces for the first time. Thus he has fulfilled his promise in the Preface "to cull a Sheridan anthology." As such his work has a unique value. Here, better than anywhere else, one may form an idea of Sheridan's ability as a lyric poet.

In Volume One, also, Mr. Sichel discusses at great length each of Sheridan's plays. The chapter on *The School for Scandal* is especially full, and valuable for its handling of the successive stages through which that comedy passed. For the purposes of this review, however, I shall confine myself to the discussion of *The Rivals*. This, I find, is not without errors. The third sentence contains the statement: "After two performances it was withdrawn"—a venerable mistake, for which no excuse can be given. The play was withdrawn after one performance. On page 500 the same error is made with further complications: "On the second night, however, the part [of Sir Lucius] was transferred with less odium [from Lee] to Clinch, and Sheridan, who in despair had thought of throwing the piece overboard, was induced by Harris, the manager, to withdraw it for revision." Clinch did not assume the rôle of Sir Lucius until the revised play was put on the boards ten nights after the first performance. On page 486 Mr. Sichel represents the Prologue as "pointing to the mask of Thalia on the proscenium." Yet Sheridan clearly says: "Pointing to the figure of Comedy"; and there was on either side of the stage, near the proscenium, a statue, one of Comedy, the other of Tragedy. These statues are shown quite clearly in a picture of the stage of the Covent Garden Theatre, reproduced in George Paston's *Social Caricatures in the Eighteenth Century*. On page 489 Mr. Sichel quotes a passage from Congreve as having suggested Bob Acres's oaths, with the remark: "A rather suspicious coincidence which the plagiarists have missed." Professor Nettleton in his edition of *The Rivals* (*The Major Dramas of*

¹ Nevertheless, Mr. Sichel begins his chapter (p. 235) dogmatically: "Richard Brinsley Butler Sheridan was born . . . towards the close of September, 1751."

Sheridan), pointed out this fact in 1906. Finally, Mr. Sichel underestimates Mrs. Malaprop's indebtedness to Mrs. Tryfort in *A Journey to Bath*.² He admits only three verbal borrowings ("Thirdly and this exhausts the list"). The present writer has counted no less than nine such borrowings. On page 299 is revealed, in a speech of Sir Anthony, an interesting reminiscence from Sheridan and Halhed's unpublished comedy *Ixion*. Even more interesting, however, is the identification of autobiographical influences in the play. From the day *The Rivals* was first presented writers have suggested that Lydia Languish and Captain Absolute represented in some measure Miss Linley and Sheridan. Mr. Sichel, however, thinks otherwise: "Faulkland and Julia . . . are true transcripts from himself and Miss Linley. Nothing can be more certain." This is ingenious, yet critics of the play will not accept so bold a statement without hesitation.

Volume Two deals entirely with Sheridan's political life, with which, of course, the student of literature is less concerned. It is conspicuous for three things: the interesting and valuable *Diary of the Duchess of Devonshire*, printed for the first time; generous excerpts from Sheridan's famous Begum speech, hitherto regarded as lost; and conclusive evidence that the remarkable state document, the Prince of Wales's *Letter to Mr. Pitt*, was written, not by Burke, as commonly believed, but by Sheridan.

In an Appendix is given a "Bibliography of Sheridan's Works, Published and Unpublished." This is far more exhaustive than any previous bibliography, yet is by no means complete. It even fails to record the most scholarly edition, Professor Nettleton's *The Major Dramas of Sheridan*, 1906. The *Index* is hard to use, and is full of errors, both of omission and commission.

Of the press-work too much can hardly be said in praise. The paper is of superior quality, the type is large and clear, and the binding, in red cloth with the arms of the Sheridan family on the sides, is tasteful and pleasing. Most noteworthy, however, is the richness of illustration. There are forty-seven full-page prints in brown, many of them now published for the first time, and together forming an invaluable collection of pictorial matter. In addition, there are three folding sheets of pedigrees. The publishers, in short, have done for the book all that could be desired.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

²On page 251 Sichel observes: "She [Mrs. Thomas Sheridan] left two acts of an unfinished comedy, '*A Journey to Bath*.'" This should read "three acts." The reference is omitted from the *Index*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

WILLIAM LILLY AND *The Alchemist*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—The two following passages from *William Lilly's History of his Life and Times* are of interest as illustrating first, the general situation of Jonson's *Alchemist*, a house left in charge of a servant during the prevalence of the plague, and secondly, the ridiculous scene (Act III, Scene 5) in which poor Dapper is introduced to the Queen of Faery. Lilly, it will be remembered, was a notable astrologer of his day, half charlatan and half the dupe of his own occult learning. His *Life* in its mixture of candor and craft, its realistic anecdote and credulous half belief, is one of the most entertaining relics of its time. The narrative, which is of course desultory in the extreme, extends from the year 1602 to 1681, having been written by Lilly in the sixty-sixth year of his age and addressed "to his worthy friend Elias Ashmole, Esq.," to whom we owe so much in the way of the preservation of manuscripts dealing with the occult. Lilly's manuscript was first published in the year 1715 by Charles Burman. It was reprinted in 1774 with the life of Ashmole, and again in 1822.

The situation in this first passage, it will be noticed, is precisely that of Lovewit and his servant Face, left in charge, even to the Master's marriage soon after. It is not even impossible to imagine Lovewit as dying, and Dame Pliant taking the clever servant for a third husband as here. But this is romancing, and in point of time the fiction preceded the fact.

"In 1625, the visitation increasing, and my master having a great charge of money and plate, some of his own, some other men's, left me and a fellow-servant to keep the house, and himself in June went into Leicestershire. He was in that year of fee collector for twelve poor alms people living in Clement Dane's churchyard; whose pensions I in his absence paid weekly, to his and the parish's great satisfaction. My master was no sooner gone down, but I bought a bas-viol, and got a master to instruct me; the intervals of time I spent in bowling in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, with Wat the cobbler, Dick the blacksmith, and such like companions. We have sometimes been at our work at six in the morning, and so continued till three or four in the afternoon, many times without bread or drink all that while. . . . In November my master came home. My fellow-servant's and my diet came weekly to six shillings and sixpence, sometimes to seven shillings, so cheap was diet at that time.

"In February of that year my master married again (one who after his death became my wife). In the same year he settled upon me, during my life, twenty pounds per annum, which I have enjoyed ever since, even to the writing hereof."

As to the second extract, it will be recalled by readers of Jonson that Dapper has been promised by the alchemist, Subtle, and his "fence," Face, a sight of "her grace" his "aunt," queen of the fairies, who is to make him heir and perform for him other wonders. His eyes are bound "with a rag," and he is pinched to the music of a cit-tern, until he throws away all his valuables to the last half-crown of gold

"about my wrist, that my love gave me
And a leaden heart I wore sin' she forsook me."

Surprised in the midst of these incantations, a gag of gingerbread is thrust into his mouth and he is locked away in an unmentionable place.

Lilly's passage represents the serious belief of the day on which Jonson's farcical scene is founded.

"Since I have related of the queen of fairies, I shall acquaint you, that it is not for every one, or every person, that these angelical creatures will appear unto, though they may say over the call, over and over, or indeed is it given to very many persons to endure their glorious aspects; even very many have failed just at that present when they are ready to manifest themselves; even persons otherwise of undaunted spirits and firm resolutions, are herewith astonished, and tremble; as it happened not many years since with us. A very sober discreet person, of virtuous life and conversation, was beyond measure desirous to see something in this nature. He went with a friend into my Hurstwood; the queen of fairies was invoked; a gentle murmuring wind came first; after that, among the hedges, a smart whirlwind; by and by a strong blast of wind blew upon the face of the friend; and the queen appearing in a most illustrious glory, 'No more, I beseech you,' quoth the friend: 'My heart fails; I am not able to endure longer.' Nor was he: his black curling hair rose up, and I believe a bullrush would have beat him to the ground.

"Sir Robert Holborn, knight, brought once unto me Gladwell of Suffolk, who had formerly had sight and conference with Uriel and Raphael, but lost both by carelessness; so that neither of them both would but rarely appear, and then presently be gone, resolving nothing. He would have given me two hundred pounds to have assisted him for their recovery, but I am no such man. Those glorious creatures, if well commanded, and well observed, do teach the master

any thing he desires; *amant secreta, fugiunt aperta*. The fairies love the southern side of hills, mountains, groves. Neatness and cleanliness in apparel, a strict diet, and upright life, fervent prayers unto God, conduce much to the assistance of those who are curious in these ways."

Apropos of this last compare *The Alchemist*, Act I, Scene ii:

Subtle.

O, good sir!

There must a world of ceremonies pass,
You must be bathed and fumigated, first.

Sir, against one a clock, prepare yourself,
Till when you must be fasting;

And, put on a clean shirt: you do not know
What grace her grace may do you in clean linen.

F. E. SCHELLING.

University of Pennsylvania.

INCLITE ARTI A RADDOLCIR LA VITA.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In a passage of Carducci's *Alle fonti del Clitumno*, which is largely inspired by Vergil's "Praises of Italy," it occurs to me that there exists an allusion, and that the understanding of the allusion is necessary to a grasp of the "psychological moment" that produced the lines. It is the final invocation to Italy:

"E tu, pia madre di giovenchi invitti
A franger glebe e rintegrar maggesi
E d'annitrenti in guerra aspri polledri
Italia madre,

Madre di biade e viti e leggi eterne
Ed inclite arti a raddolcir la vita,
Salve! a te i canti de l'antica lode
Io rinnovello. . ."

The italicized line is a relic of Carducci's enormous erudition, an erudition which he utilized in all his poems, and which he acknowledged where possible within his verses,¹ or, in the most important cases, in special commenting notes. It is this erudition that gives him the very high rank he holds among Italian epic poets. For the epic of art, in the narrow sense of the term, must be at bottom a work of erudition. It will be a great epic or a failure according as the erudition is artistically interpreted. The works of Trissino and his followers are note-books of history dis-

¹ Cf. the splendid citation from Goethe at the end of *Ca ira*.

torted by "imagination"; Carducci's history is interpreted in general summaries fused by lyric power. He must have been conscious of this distinction himself as he composed his lines on Hannibal and thought of Petrarch's futile attempt to force poetry into those same events. But if the ode to the Clitumnus is as a whole a summary of Italian history, the last verses are a prophecy; and the words in question associate Carducci's mood of the moment with a line of interest very dear to him—the revivification of the Hellenic ideal, of which Italy was to give a re-expression, and of which he felt himself an apostle. For he is here applying to Italy a thought that was originally applied to Athens herself, and became in various adaptations a sort of commonplace. It first appeared in a decree of the Delphic Council, which declared that "Athens first won mankind from the life of wild beasts to gentleness." It occurs again in Dion of Halicarnassus: "The Athenians made gentle our common life," or to report exactly the translation of Gilbert Murray, "made gentle the life of the world."¹ Italy, mother of the *inclite arti*, is to Carducci the new Athens, the great civilizer; but her civilization is not to be that which "made a desert and called it the kingdom of God," but a culture rational and sensitive, full of intellect and soul; and its monument will be not of marble from Serravezza or Versilia, beautiful as that may be with its intertwining vein of color, but from

Paro gentil dal cui marpesio fianco
Uscian d'Ellas gli dei . . .
O Paro, o Grecia, antichità serena,
Datemi i marmi e i carmi.²

A. A. LIVINGSTON.

Cornell University.

A CORRECTION.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In a recent article in *Modern Language Notes* (January, 1911, p. 15¹) I refer to Lord Burleigh, or Burghley, as 'only five years senior to Leicester and the Queen.' Instead of 'five years,' 'thirteen years' should be read, for Burghley was born in 1520, Elizabeth in 1533, and Leicester in 1532 or 1533. I am quite unable to explain how the inaccuracy got into my text and escaped my notice in the proof, in spite of a careful preliminary verification of the dates con-

cerned. I do not believe that the necessary correction will affect my argument in any appreciable degree.

C. F. TUCKER BROOKE.

Yale University.

BRIEF MENTION.

The translation by Professor Josselyn of Flaminio's *Avviamento allo Studio della Divina Commedia*,¹ is as welcome as it is attractive in appearance. The original work occupies so peculiar a position, compared with other hand-books of Dante studies, as to make it extremely desirable that it should be easily accessible to those interested in the subject, whose command of Italian is imperfect. As the author says in his preface, it is indeed "not a work of compilation," and even those who disagree with his conclusions will admit that it marks a distinct advance in interpretation, beyond other works with a similar object.

The translation invites confidence, and has been revised by the author, who has also made corrections and additions, and brought the bibliography up to date. It may be said, too, that notwithstanding the warning that the work "has been translated with more attention to fidelity than to literary elegance," the result is an exceedingly readable book. It would be a very exacting critic who would presume to point out serious faults of expression, altho the following sentences might be improved: "It is more exact to call it by this name, ['the mountain of Earthly Paradise'] rather than the mountain of Purgatory, since the latter is only temporary (from the Redemption to the Last Judgment)" (p. 44, n. 4). "Then they descend into the seventh ledge" (p. 57), "... until towards the end of the middle of the sixteenth century" (pp. 118-119). One may object also to the following: "Lucifer has six wings, in large part because he is a *seraphim*" (p. 40, n.); and to the note on "Francesca da Polenta": "Often called Francesca da Rimini, from the town over which the *Polentas* were lords" (p. 55, n.), and perhaps to the use of the Shaksperian "luxury" (p. 80) to translate "*lussuria*."

The translator is to be thanked for adding a "short list of books in English, useful for the beginner in Dante study," which, however, does not include Fay's *Concordance*, and Grandgent's *Inferno* is placed under the head of translations of the *Canzoniere*.

¹ For the text and history of the Greek citations, see Gilbert Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1907, pp. 2 and 28.

² *Intermezzo*, ix.

¹ *Introduction to the Study of the Divine Comedy by Francesco Flaminio*. Translated by Freeman M. Josselyn. Boston-New York-Chicago-London: Ginn and Company.